



Division LIBRARY USE

R

Section LIBRARY USE

A-1.99

No. LIBRARY USE

A15

1821



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 8.—October, 1881.

I.

NOTES ON THE REVISED NEW TESTAMENT.

THE long-expected Revision is at last before the public. The first rattling volley from the newspapers has spent itself with the result which might have been predicted ; aiding to stimulate the general curiosity, but doing very little to satisfy serious and intelligent inquiry as to the true merits or demerits of the work.

Too much has not been said, too much cannot be said of the general excellence and the wonderful value and power of our Authorized Version. The interest awakened by the Revision is the grandest of all testimonies to these. All that has been so eloquently written concerning its racy, nervous English, its service to literature, and the tenderness, dignity, and inspiring character of its associations, may be reaffirmed with emphasis ; and hence the Revisers were no more than judicious in laying down as one of their first and principal canons—to avoid all unnecessary changes in that which years and associations have made so precious. But on this point two things may be said, the one concerning the Revisers, the other concerning the readers.

As to the Revisers, it may be safely affirmed that nothing in their admirable preface justifies extravagant expectations on this head. Their clearly stated rule is, that the alterations to be introduced should be expressed, *as far as possible*, in the language of the Authorized Version or of the Revisions that preceded it. They are, moreover, at pains to set forth their endeavor, when compelled to use other words, to find such as

were employed by standard writers of nearly the same date, and of the same "general hue" with the language of the existing version. They have held by all archaisms which retained, in any degree, their ancient meaning, and have, as we think, even overstrained this rule.

But by some means or other, unwarrantable expectations appear to have been excited respecting this part of the work, and the first feeling awakened in many minds by the Revision has been one of disappointment that the new does not resemble the old so closely as to make it difficult to detect a change.

Now, with the very best intentions on the part of the Revisers, such men as Archbishop Trench and Bishops Lightfoot and Ellicott, all of whom had carefully studied beforehand the demands and possibilities of revision, and had written copiously on the subject, could not but have known that the *necessary* changes would be numerous. Moreover, no men knew better than the members of the New Testament Committee, that a single strange or new word dropped into a verse or paragraph which has become as household speech (as the Lord's prayer for instance), must affect its cadence, its rhythm, in short its general impression upon the ear. The slightest change would necessarily affect the whole, like a single drop of a flavoring essence in a larger mass of fluid. How much more then when, as Bishop Ellicott stated in his speech in convocation on presenting the new Revision, there are in the Gospels eight or nine changes in every five verses, and in the Epistles three changes in every verse. If this committee proposed, as there is every reason for thinking they did not, a Revision in which the changes should be hardly perceptible to the average reader, they proposed a simple impossibility. Their first duty to the Word itself, as faithful custodians and expounders of its meaning, was to give the meaning of the true text as nearly as it could be expressed in English. It is all well to tell us how "the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life"; that "it is a false and dangerous sentiment that the authority and blessing of Scripture lies in the special significance of its words and sentences," and that "we need a revised set of canons of interpretation of the whole significance of Scripture more than we do a revised text." Granting whatever modicum of truth may be

contained in these statements, it cannot be denied that the average man's road to the Spirit lies through the letter; that the "special significance of words and sentences" is one of the divinely chosen vehicles for conveying the authority of Scripture, and that, however much we may need new canons of general interpretation, it is presumably necessary to this that we should be informed as accurately as possible what it is that is to be interpreted. The Old Version, sacred and precious as its associations are, contains palpable and mischievous blunders, and some of the most cherished associations have centred round the blunders. To correct the blunders and at the same time leave the associations intact, was a task which might have daunted even a wiser body of men than the Revisers.

This thing, then, they have not done, nor could they do it. With a reverence for the Authorized Version quite equal to that of their most enthusiastic critics, their first duty has been to the Word itself, and not to its existing translation. They could not by any possibility make anything worthy the name of a Revision, which should come to the people at large with a perfectly familiar flavor. The single change of "charity" to "love," right and thoroughly defensible as it is, spoils the familiar dactylic rhythm :

"Charity | suffereth | long and is | kind |
Charity | envieth | not " : |

and, of itself, modifies the impression of the entire chapter on the ear. This, then, must be assumed in any proper estimate of the Revision. If one likes the Old Version, blunders and all, better than the new, he has the privilege of reading it; but he is not to expect of men whose task is not only to make a new translation, but in many cases to recover and restore the true substance of what is to be translated, to give him at the same time a *correct* version, and one which shall sound like the old one.

The second point relates to the readers. After all just and hearty concessions to the excellencies of the Old Version, and to the sterling Christian sentiment which cherishes it, may not this sentiment possibly be a little exacting in its demands? Is reverence for King James' Revision to be practically without limit? Are those to be allowed to have it all their own way

who persist in regarding it as an inspired volume, and in raising the cry of sacrilege against the man who presumes to criticise or to amend it? Are such to be allowed without protest to lock up the English Scriptures from the advanced scholarship of this century?

It is farther true that a certain amount of opposition to the Revision is the protest of the spiritual and mental indolence which it so vigorously and persistently disturbs; and which, having comfortably adjusted itself to King James' Version as to a bed, having matted down the awkward humps, and somehow disposed itself among the inconvenient ridges, complains bitterly of being compelled to rise and have its bed remade. The voice is the voice of the same laziness which cries out for "restful" preaching, and which dreads innovation more because of its strangeness than of its possible error. For many Christian people are lazy in their Bible-reading, as in their praying and working. The Revision confronts such at every verse with something which challenges inquiry. They cannot read this book loungingly. It disturbs their repose, and insists on their consulting commentaries, dictionaries, and grammars. Archbishop Trench evidently foresaw some such result as this, when he wrote:

"Nor is it impossible that the very unsettlement of men's minds consequent upon the stirring of this question, might be found to bring with it some compensation. This putting to the proof of the words in which God's message had hitherto been conveyed to them—might it not for some be a motive to a more accurate and thoughtful consideration of the message itself? It would not, I imagine, be, for most of us, unprofitable to discover that the words in which the truth has hitherto reached us, are exchangeable for other, in some places, it may be, for better words. The shock, unpleasant and unwelcome as it would perhaps prove at the first, might yet be a startling of many from a dull, lethargic, unprofitable reading of God's Word; a breaking up of that hard crust of formality which so easily overgrows our study of the Scriptures; while, in the rousing of the energies of the mind to defend the old, or, before admitting, thoroughly to test the new, more insight into it might be gained, with new grasp of its deeper meaning, than years of lazy familiarity would have given."

To any right estimate of this work it is indispensable that we should have as correct an appreciation as possible of the nature and magnitude of the task before the Revisers. It is easy for those who do not appreciate difficulties to find fault with performance. Here, for instance, is our familiar Version, based on an imperfect text, the correction and settlement of which implies acquaintance with one of the most abstruse and difficult branches of New Testament criticism, including not

only knowledge of manuscripts, but mastery of the principles on which the dates of these manuscripts are to be determined, and critical acquaintance with a thousand minute indications which determine whether their numerous corrections have been made by an earlier or a later hand; a knowledge, moreover, of old versions in various languages, Syriac, Armenian, Coptic, Ethiopic, complicated farther by the question how far these versions have been modified by later influences, and then the comparison and collation of hundreds of variations in these manuscripts and versions.*

Again, though exposition and translation are not the same, translation is nevertheless bound up with exposition, and a formidable array of exegetical difficulties emerge in such passages as Colossians ii. 15, 18, which latter verse even so eminent a critic as Bishop Lightfoot gives up; Galatians iii. 20, which has been the subject of from two to three hundred interpretations; Philippians ii. 7, of which Professor Bruce says that the varieties of exposition are enough to afflict the student with intellectual paralysis; 1 John iii. 20, 21; Gal. i. 10, where the little marginal note suggests the troublesome controversy as to whether the fourteen years are to be counted from Paul's conversion or from the visit to Jerusalem; with scores of others, all which must be settled before the passage can receive its proper shape in translation.

Then, too, while the great grammatical lines between the tenses are clearly defined, we find them, in the practical uses of speech and writing, in not a few cases, shading into each other, making the choice of rendering in many cases, as between the perfect and the aorist for instance, a matter of the utmost delicacy and difficulty. There, moreover, are particles, carrying niceties of thought and delicate connections, not only impossible to transfer accurately to another tongue, but the exact force of which has slipped away in the lapse of centuries and the death of the language, like the subtle play of expres-

* Any one who will be at pains to read Porson's letters to Travis on the genuineness of John v. 7, 8, and to follow the history of the discussion which has resulted in eliminating it from the text, or will weigh the evidence for John vii. 53-viii. 11, or enter into the contest between *ὅς* and *θεός* in 1 Tim. iii. 16, where so much turns on the origin and meaning of a microscopic line, may awake to some faint notion of the enormous difficulties which must be faced before the work of translation can be even begun.

sion from a dead face. There is the fact that in translation, as in finance, there is a premium on exchange, involving loss to one language or the other ; there are the inevitable changes which time has effected in the English tongue, the modification, and sometimes the reversal of meaning which years have wrought in words familiar centuries ago. There is the problem furnished by the reconciliation of the unity of style in a book rendered into a kind of "sacred language," with the changes necessitated by the restoration of a correct text and the correction of obvious errors in the former translation. Any one who shall measure these and a score of other questions of equal difficulty and delicacy, will be convinced that even such a body of scholars as the New Testament Committee have undertaken a task which must tax their learning, their judgment, and their skill to their utmost limits. Any one who shall look for a work combining in itself perfect and symmetrical solutions of all these difficulties will be disappointed.

At the same time the work of such men as these Revisers challenges respectful attention. It is the work of men who are, most of them, recognized authorities. The result of the ten years' labor of such scholars as Ellicott, Lightfoot, Westcott, Scrivener, Stanley, Wordsworth, Hort, Moulton, Woolsey, Abbott, Schaff, Crosby, is not to be waved aside by the pompous dictum of prelates, whistled down the wind by pulpit mountebanks, or disposed of out of hand by the rattling paragraphs of the daily newspaper. One may well be conscious of a sincere diffidence in approaching the examination of such a work, especially within so short a time after its appearance. Only leisurely study and patient digestion of the book as a whole can enable one to fully grasp and arrange the principles which underlie the numerous changes. The material, moreover, cannot be easily handled in large masses. Sound criticism of it involves much detailed discussion, and consequently requires far more space than can be properly accorded to a paper of this character.

In entering upon this "*selva selvaggia*," we must forego all discussion of the important question which lies at the very gate, namely, the text. Apart from the fact that we have not, at the time of writing, the text adopted by the Revisers, any such incidental discussion as our limits would allow would be

practically useless ; and, above all, the subject is one for special treatment at the hands of a specialist, and is therefore not within our province.

ORDER AND EMPHASIS.

One cannot read many verses of the Revised Translation without observing the tendency of the Revisers to follow very closely the order of the Greek. While in some instances this is done with good effect, in others the translation does not appear to gain enough to warrant the change. Where the object has been to point the emphasis, the Revisers do not appear always to have kept in mind the difference between the Greek and the English laws of emphasis ; the English emphasis depending on the voice more than on position, while the Greek, by the peculiar position of emphatic words, speaks to the eye as well as to the ear. On this point Bishop Ellicott, in his comment on 1 Thess. ii. 17 (translation), remarks very appositely :

“The discrepancy between the English and the Greek position of emphasis has been far too much neglected by modern revisers, who, too often, seem to think that, in all cases, the most complete faithfulness is attained by following the order of the original.”

It cannot be denied that men whose acquaintance with the New Testament is mainly formed at the fountain-head, are not altogether free from the danger of insensibly casting its thought into the familiar Greek form when they come to render it into English ; and we must allow that the Revisers have not altogether escaped this danger. As examples of what seem to us needless changes of arrangement for the sake of following the Greek order, we note Matt. i. 23, “which is being interpreted,” for “which being interpreted is” ; Matt. iii. 3, “Isaiah the prophet” for “the prophet Isaiah” ; iii. 10, “is the ax laid” for “the ax is laid” ; iii. 12, “the chaff he will burn up” for “he will burn up the chaff” ; iv. 17, “began Jesus” for “Jesus began” ; v. 25, “with him in the way” for “in the way with him” ; vii. 5, “cast out first” for “first cast out” ; xviii. 16, “two witnesses or three” for “two or three witnesses” ; John v. 34, “I say these things” for “these things I say.” So Matt. xvii. 13 ; 2 Cor. xii. 3 ; Matt. xi. 21. At Matt. xx. 3, the fact of idleness is not, to the English reader, made any more emphatic by reading “standing in the market-

place idle," than by "standing idle in the market-place." In other cases, however, the Greek order is followed with decided advantage to the sense. Such, for example, is John vi. 32, where for "Moses gave you not that bread from heaven," we have, "it was not Moses that gave you," thus properly putting the emphasis on Moses as compared with the Father, while the Authorized Version leaves it doubtful whether the emphasis is not on the bread from heaven. In Matt. xxv. 40, a very familiar passage is greatly enhanced in force by a close adherence to the Greek order: "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, *even the least*, ye did it unto me." Here the detachment of the italicized words marks them as emphatic; while the A. V. misses the *progress* of the Lord's thought from the general to the special; first regarding the brethren collectively, then the fact of degrees among the brethren, and at last, specifically and emphatically bringing the very lowest of the lowest degree within the scope of his saying. In John xii. 13, "King of Israel" acquires by a similar detachment the emphasis which was intended by the Greek order, and which is lost or obscured in the A. V. There is a climax in the verse: "Blessed is he that cometh; that cometh in the name of the Lord, yea, more, who is himself the King of Israel." In John xiv. 22, the verse reads more smoothly and neatly by bringing "not Iscariot," as in the Greek, next to the proper name to which it is appended. At Phil. iii. 16, it will be evident how the true antithesis between "*attained*" and "*walked*" is brought out by following the Greek order, while it is lost or partially obscured in the A. V. Now that "let us mind the same thing" is rejected from the text, we have the clean, sharp antithesis in the revised rendering, "Whercunto we have already *attained*, by that same rule let us *walk*"; whereas in the A. V. the antithesis is rather between "*attained*" and "the same thing." The Greek method of emphasis by means of a suspended sentence is also followed, in some cases with advantage, by the Revisers. For instance, the rendering of John xvii. 24, which we have heard criticised as a needless and hurtful change: "Father, that which thou hast given me, I will that where I am, they also may be with me." Similarly we have Matt. x. 32 in the A. V.: "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess," instead of "I will confess him who"; or

Matt. xiii. 20, "He that was sown upon the rocky places (the subject of the explanation and therefore emphatic), this is he that heareth, etc." So in the passage in question, they whom God has given to Christ, collectively considered, these especially, these only are the subjects of His petition (conf. v. 9). They are thrown therefore into the foreground in a kind of suspended sentence, and thus attention is called to them. 1 John ii. 7, seems to us to gain in respect of proper emphasis by this adherence to Greek order. The objection anticipated by the Apostle after dilating upon the law of love, is formulated in the words "new commandment." This thought then is naturally prominent in his reply. "Beloved, no *new* commandment write I unto you, but an *old* commandment." In like manner there is a gain in 1 John v. 9, where the A. V. is a little obscure through the mistranslation of *οτι*. The Revision, besides correcting the error, emphasizes the "this" by observing the Greek order. "The witness of God is *this*; that (namely, that) he hath testified of his Son."

CONSISTENCY.

We enter here upon a large and somewhat complicated question. We are bound to recognize the clear appreciation of the difficulty before them which appears in the preface of the Revisers. That the translators of 1611 made variety of rendering one of their cardinal principles is a familiar fact. The reader of their Version is therefore constantly confronted with arbitrary and confusing differences in the rendering of the same word. Thus *καταργέω*, which is used about twenty-seven times, has seventeen different renderings; and *ζηλόω* nine, out of a total of twelve passages; while *λογίζομαι*, which occurs eleven times in Romans iv., is translated in that chapter by three different words. The Revisers' remarks on this subject should be carefully studied and noted in all attempts to review their work.

Let us look first at the rendering of the preposition *διὰ*, perhaps the most difficult of the prepositions to translate with any approach to consistency throughout the wide range of its uses with the genitive and accusative cases. Now Matt. i. 22 will naturally furnish the first opportunity for applying the distinc-

tion between the primary and secondary agency of God, and for laying down the normal rendering of *διὰ* to express the latter. Here then the Revisers lay down by their rendering the principle that *διὰ*, when it represents the working of God through some secondary agency, as *διὰ τοῦ προφήτου*, is to be rendered "through," instead of "by," as in the A. V. Have we not then a right to ask, on what principle "by" is retained and "through" consigned to the margin in three instances in the next chapter, vv. 5, 17, 23, and in the identical phrase; why, in that very chapter, ver. 15, "by" is again changed to "through," as also in Matt. xxvi. 24, and again resumed in Matt. viii. 17; xii. 17; xiii. 35; xxi. 4; xxiv. 15; xxvii. 9; Luke xviii. 31; Acts ii. 16; xxviii. 25? Certainly no canon which the Revisers have laid down can be cited in defence of this inconsistency, against which it is gratifying to see that the American Committee have entered their protest in the Appendix.

Let us follow this preposition a little farther; this time on the line of its rendering with the accusative. In Mark ii. 4, we have *διὰ τὸν ὄχλον*, rendered "*for* the crowd," and ver. 27, *διὰ τὸ σάββατον*, "*for* the Sabbath," both following the A. V. In Mark iii. 9 we find, as in the A. V., "*because* of the crowd," and in Luke xxiii. 19, "*for* sedition and murder." Now, according to the Revisers' rule of "consequence," we are to look for the first occurrence of this construction, and, having settled the translation of that, to adhere to it, unless there should be some special reason to the contrary. The first instance, then, of this construction with *διὰ* we find in Matt. xiii. 21, *διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον*, where the A. V. "because of" is retained. Now turning to Mark iv. 17, we read *διὰ τὸν λόγον* "for the word's sake," *instead of* A. V. "because of the word." If, then, as we are at first led to suppose, the renderings were left unchanged in Matthew to avoid needless disturbance of the A. V., why change in Mark "for the word's sake" to "because of the word," possibly to agree with "because of the word" in Matt. xiii. 21, and not change "for the crowd" in Mark ii. 4, to "because of the crowd" to agree with Mark iii. 9? And why not say "because of sedition and murder" as well as "because of the word"? Take the rendering "for the sake of." In John xii. 30, Jesus says, "this voice came not *δι' ἐμὲ* but *δι' ὑμᾶς*,"

where the Revisers properly change "because of me" to "for my sake," to correspond with "for your sakes," the rendering of A.V. So, Rom. iv. 24. "It was not written *for* us" is changed to "for our sake"; 1 Pet. i. 20, "manifest *for* you" is changed to "for your sake"; to which there can be no objection; only, why not then say in 1 Cor. xi. 9, "the man was not created for *the sake of* the woman, but the woman for *the sake of* the man," instead of retaining the A.V. "*for* the woman and *for* the man"? Why read in 2 Cor. iv. 11, "we are alway delivered unto death for Jesus' sake," and not change Phil. iii. 7, to "for Christ's sake," instead of retaining "for Christ"? Why not read in the next verse, "for whose sake" instead of "for whom"? In 1 Cor. x. 27, 28, "for conscience's sake" is rightly retained, but why not, then, render the same phrase in 1 Pet. ii. 19, in the same way, instead of retaining "for conscience toward God"; especially since, in Heb. i. 14, "*for* them who shall be heirs" is changed to "*for the sake of* them"; and in Heb. vi. 7 we have "for whose sake it is tilled"?

That absolute consistency in the use of such a preposition is impossible, we do not need to be told. "Because," "for," "for the sake of," "by," "through," are all correct renderings, and must all have their place in the translation. Persecution *because of* the word is better than *for* the word, and *for the sake of* murder and sedition would not be as good as *because of* or *for*.* But we cannot perceive that any marked approach to uniformity or consistency is made by the changes adopted in the Revision. The elements of inconsistency merely change places, and the categories of these various uses of the preposition are scarcely more sharply defined than before.

A few remarks on some other prepositions will be in place here. We may note some inconsistency in the rendering of *ὑπέρ*. In Phil. i. 3, "prayer *for* you" is changed to "*on behalf of* you"; but in Acts viii. 24; xii. 5; Rom. viii. 26, 27; x. 1; xv. 30; Col. i. 9; James v. 16, all treating of prayer, "for" is retained; while in 2 Cor. i. 11, "prayer for us" is changed to "supplication on our behalf," and in ix. 14, "for

* In Matt. xv. 3, 6, the A. V. "*by* your tradition," is improved by the rendering "because of," and would have been farther improved by rendering "for the sake of," as may be seen from the commentary furnished by Mark vii. 9, "that ye may keep your own tradition."

you" to "on your behalf." The sense of "for" is so clear that nothing seems to be gained by the change to "on behalf" in these few cases.

With regard to *ἐν*, we observe that the Revisers have been at pains to remove the vicious confusion of that preposition with *εἰς* so common in the A. V. They leave Matt. xxvii. 12 unchanged—"they did *unto* him," *ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ*; but we read in Eph. i. 20, "he wrought in Christ"; Mk. xiv. 6, "she hath wrought a good work *on me*" (*ἐν ἐμοί*); and in 1 Cor. ix. 15, we find "unto me" (*ἐν ἐμοί*) changed to "in my case"; so that we think they might have rendered here "they wrought or did *on* him." In John iii. 35 they could, perhaps, scarcely do otherwise than retain "hath given all things *into*"; as the combination of *ἐν* with *δίδωμεν* can hardly be expressed with neatness otherwise. A marked instance of the value of this change is found in Rom. v. 21, in which *εἰς* and *ἐν* both occur, and where the Revision brings out a distinction which is lost in the A. V.—as sin reigned "*in* death," so might grace reign "*unto* eternal life." In 2 Cor. v. 19, though "unto us" is retained for *θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν*, the margin reads "placed in us," the idea being "lodged with us." In 2 Pet. i. 5, the much-needed correction is made which changes the figure of adding one grace to another, to that of developing one grace out of another. "*In* your faith supply virtue, and in your virtue knowledge, etc." In cases where *εἰς* has the force of *ἐν* in the A. V. the Revisers have made fewer changes, and wisely, since they would involve more awkwardness and consequent damage to the version than gain to the sense which is sufficiently clear. Nevertheless they have rendered "*into* good ground" for "on" in Mark iv. 8; "*upon* the way" for "in," Matt. xi. 8; in 2 Cor. xi. 3, they give us the important change "*toward* Christ" for "in Christ"; in Eph. i. 10, "*unto* a dispensation" for "in the dispensation"; in Phil. i. 5; ii. 22, "*in furtherance of* the gospel" for "*in*"; in John xvii. 23, "perfected *into* one" for "perfect in"; in 1 Cor. viii. 6, "*unto* him" for "in him"; and in every case of *βαπτίζειν εἰς*, "baptize *into* the name" for "in"; in Mark xiv. 20, "into the dish" would have been better than "in"; and the force of the preposition would have appeared without sacrificing either sense or euphony by rendering, "*into* bundles" for "in," Matt. xiii. 30; and "*into*

prison" for "in," in Acts xii. 4. Passages like Matt. ii. 23; iv. 13; x. 9; xiii. 33; are wisely let alone.

For *ὑπό*, the Revision retains "by," "of," "under," "with," "from." "Of" is often changed to "by" without apparent reason. Thus in Matt. xiii. 14; iv. 1; xi. 27; Luke viii. 29, we have "of." Why change to "by" in Matt. xxvii. 12; Luke ii. 18; Acts xxiii. 10? In Acts xxiii. 27, we have "this man was taken *by* the Jews," for "of" in A.V.; but in the same verse, "and was about to be slain *of* them," *ὑπ' αὐτῶν*. So in Matt. xi. 7 "a reed shaken *with* the wind," as A.V.; but xiv. 24, "the ship was tossed *by* waves" for "with" of A.V. In Luke vi. 18, and Acts v. 16, "vexed *with* unclean spirits," as A.V.; but Acts xvii. 25, "worshipped *by* men's hands" for "with" of A.V. Acts xxvii. 41, "broken *by* the violence of the waves" for "with," and similarly 2 Peter ii. 7, 17. We have noticed no case in which "by" is changed to "with" or "of."

Leaving the prepositions, let us now examine some other words. The distinction between *τέραῖς*, *σημεῖον* and *δύναμις* as signifying miraculous manifestations is well understood: *τέραῖς* is the miracle regarded as a prodigy, as adapted to excite amazement; *σημεῖον* is the miracle as a *sign* of the worker's power and grace; while *δύναμις* is the "outcoming of the divine *power*, imparted to those who are his witnesses and ambassadors." All three occur in Acts ii. 22, where the distinction is recognized, the Revisers changing "miracles" of the A.V. to "mighty works," with "powers" in the margin, for *δυνάμεις*. *τέραῖς* is consistently rendered by the "wonders" of the A.V. The first example of *δύναμις* in this sense is Matt. vii. 22, where "wonderful works" is properly changed to "mighty works," with "powers" in the margin, which marginal note occurs throughout, apparently, wherever the phrase "mighty works" is used. In Acts viii. 13, we find it rendered "miracles," perhaps to escape the awkwardness caused by the adjective *μεγάλαις*; still they might have put into the text the word "powers" which is in the margin, especially since in Heb. ii. 4 they have changed "miracles" of the A.V. to "powers." Similarly we have "miracles" retained in Acts xix. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29, which is open to two objections: 1st, that "miracle," etymologically, is an unfortunate rendering of *δύναμις*, being essentially a *wonderful* thing (*mirum*) and consequent-

ly more nearly akin to *τέρασις*, of which, as we have seen, the dominant idea is marvel; and 2d, because "miracle" has been appropriated by the Revisers for *σημεῖον* also. In most cases *σημεῖον* is rendered "sign." In nineteen instances the Revision changes "miracles," and in three "wonders," to "signs." When therefore we read, John ii. 11, "this beginning of signs did Jesus," for A.V. "miracles," we naturally ask why in Luke xxiii. 8, Acts iv. 16, 22, we have "miracles" retained and "signs" in the margin?

Let us take another case: *παράκλησις, παραμύδιον, παραμυθία*. For the two latter, each of which occurs but once, we have "consolation" instead of A.V. "comfort." *παράκλησις* is seven times rendered "consolation"; in Acts xv. 31, with "exhortation" in the margin.* Twelve times it is rendered "comfort," once "entreaty," once "encouragement."

In fifteen cases the rendering "exhortation" would be inadmissible. In Rom. xv. 4, some, as Beet, for instance, render "exhortation of the Scriptures" for "comfort." In 2 Cor. viii. 4, "exhortation" would be an improvement on "entreaty," the idea of which is sufficiently conveyed by "beseeching," while moreover "exhortation" would better harmonize with ver. 6. They exhorted us so effectually that we exhorted Titus, and (17) Titus accepted our exhortation. Thus we should have a chain of exhortations, beginning with the Macedonian Christians, passing through Paul and Titus, and so to the liberal gifts of the Church. This is the rendering of both Stanley and Alford. There is no more reason for retaining "entreaty" than for changing "consolation" to "comfort" in 2 Cor. i. 5, 6, 7.

In several cases we are unpleasantly impressed by the substitution of "behold" for "see" (*θεωρέω*). Thus John xii. 45, "He that *beholdeth* me beholdeth him that sent me": xiv. 17, "The Spirit of truth whom the world cannot receive, for it *beholdeth* him not"; and ver. 19: "The world beholdeth me no more, but ye behold me." For *θεωρέω* the Revisers mostly give "behold," often changing from "see," but in some cases rendering "see," "perceive," "consider." As between "see"

* Unnecessarily, as it seems to us, because though the letter from the council at Jerusalem contained exhortation, the prevailing sentiment upon its reception would be *consolation*, at the relief from the burden which the judaizing teachers had unlawfully sought to impose.

and "behold," the commonly accepted distinction is that "behold" denotes a more fixed and attentive exercise of the perceptions. Thus Worcester says: "A person *beholds* that which excites interest or admiration; he *sees* involuntarily." But Acts vii. 56, where Stephen says: (Rev.) "Behold I *see* the heavens opened," is not surely spoken of mere incidental seeing; for (ver. 55) "he looked up *stedfastly* into heaven." Supposing this distinction just stated to be recognized, the better rendering would be, "Lo! I *behold* the heavens opened"; and in Acts xix. 26, xxi. 20, on the same supposition, "behold" would be better than "see," since in both cases the attention is specially called to a fact. So, in Mark xvi. 4, the Revisers read, "they *see* that the stone is rolled back"; but surely their eyes were strained towards the tomb. Evidently the Revisers have not been guided by this law of distinction; for in Luke xxiv. 39, where the Greek is ἰδετε, Christ calling the disciples' attention directly and fixedly to His wounds, they have changed the A. V. "behold," which, on this theory, would be eminently correct, to "see"; while in Matt. xi. 7, they make what we cannot help feeling is a very awkward and violent change by reading for θεῶσασθαι, "what went ye out into the wilderness to *behold*?"

Let us then take another supposition. In John xvi. 17, we find the two words in one verse: "see" as the rendering of ὁφεισθε, and "behold" for θεωρεῖτε. Dean Alford draws the distinction as between θεωρεῖτε, *physical* seeing, and ὁφεισθε, *spiritual* seeing, which "began to be fulfilled at the Resurrection, received its main fulfilment at Pentecost, and shall have its final completion at the great return of the Lord hereafter." (Greek Test. ad loc.) Similarly Meyer refers ὁφεισθε to spiritual seeing (*geistige Schauen*) leaving the meaning of θεωρεῖτε to be inferred; and so Lange. But evidently this rule does not guide the Revisers: for Acts x. 11, of Peter's seeing in a trance is "beholdeth" (θεωρεῖ, A. V. "saw"). Acts xix. 26, "ye *see* (θεωρεῖτε) that Paul hath persuaded much people"; retaining the A. V. Acts xxi. 20, "Thou seest (θεωρεῖς) how many thousands have believed"; in both which ordinary observation is appealed to. In short, we are unable to discover the principle which the Revisers have followed in the rendering of this word θεωρεῖω. There is, for instance, no reason why, if

consistency were aimed at, Heb. vii. 4, "consider," should not be "behold," or "see," especially as it is the only case of this rendering. John iv. 19; Acts xvii. 22; xxvii. 10, could not well be "behold," but might be "see." John xii. 19 changes "perceive" to "behold," but as "ye behold" is in the margin, we might read "ye see."

In 1 Cor. xiii. 6, we have "rejoiceth not in *iniquity*" (ἀδυνία) changed to "unrighteousness." Here again we confess ourselves puzzled to know the principle followed by the Revisers in making their changes. The first occurrence of the word is at Luke xiii. 27, "ye workers of iniquity," where the rendering of the A. V. is retained. The words "iniquity" and "unrighteousness" have come to be used almost synonymously, though, on the basis of the etymology of "iniquity," lexicographers emphasize in it the idea of *injustice*, violation of another's rights (*inaequus*); while "unrighteousness" would, from an etymological standpoint, be a more general term, implying all deviation from right, whether involving another's interests or not. But this distinction is certainly not followed in the Revision. The word ἀδυνία is used twenty-five times. In four instances, Luke xiii. 27; Acts i. 18; viii. 23; James iii. 6, "iniquity" is retained from the A. V. In two of these cases, at least, there is no special implication of wrong to others. "Workers of iniquity" who are driven from Christ are evil-doers in general; and there is no reason why "unrighteousness" would not have answered as well, if it had been the rendering of the A. V. In two cases, 1 Cor. xiii. 6; 2 Tim. ii. 19, "iniquity" is changed to "unrighteousness," rightly enough if this distinction were observed, since wrongdoing in general is in question. But in Luke xvi. 8, the unjust steward, ἄδικος expressing in his case the idea of wrong or fraud toward his master, becomes the "unrighteous" steward; just as in Luke xviii. 6, we have "the *unrighteous* judge" for "the *unjust* judge" of the A. V. In ten cases, the "unrighteous" of the A. V. is retained. In Heb. viii. 12, "unrighteousness" becomes "iniquities," probably in order to express the plural. Neither of the words would have answered in 2 Cor. xii. 13 as well as that which has been retained from the A. V. "wrong," but we can see no reason for changing twice, as in 2 Pet. ii. 13, 15, "unrighteousness" into "wrong doing."

Strange work is made with *παρᾱγγέλλω*. In many passages it is rendered "charge" for "command" in A. V. : for example, Acts i. 4; iv. 18; v. 28; xxiii. 30. At Luke ix. 21, where occur *ἐπιτιμῆσαι* and *παρᾱγγεῖλεν*, the former is rendered "charged," and the latter "commanded," as A. V. In Mk. viii. 6; Luke viii. 29; 2 Thess. iii. 4, 6; 1 Tim. iv. 11, "command" is retained, and in 1 Tim. v. 7, "give in charge" is changed to "command."

Λυχρία, in Matt. v. 15, and wherever else it occurs in the gospels (four times in all), is rendered "stand"; very properly, because the thing which is lighted is not a candle, but a lamp, *λύχνος*, which, of course is not set on a "candlestick." In Hebrews and Revelation, however, "candlestick" is retained, though the same thing is meant. For example, we have in Heb. ix. 2, the description of the outer sanctuary wherein was *ἡ λυχρία*. In the description of this implement in Exod. xxv. 31, 39, we read, "thou shalt make the seven *lamps* thereof"; and in the prophetic vision of Zechariah (iv. 2), where the imagery is drawn from the sanctuary, we have a "candlestick," with "a bowl upon the top of it, and his seven lamps thereon, and seven pipes (for the oil, *vid.* ver. 12) to the seven lamps which are upon the top thereof." This is one of the cases where it is easier to raise the objection than to supply the remedy. At the same time, the consistent change of "candlestick" to "stand" or "lampstand" throughout Hebrews and Revelation would have been no more violent than some other changes which have been made.*

Πτεινᾶ, in Matt. vi. 26 and elsewhere, is rendered "birds," for "fowls" in the A. V., except in Acts x. 12, xi. 6, where "fowls" is retained, for what reason we cannot say.

The American Committee have noted the inconsistency in the rendering of *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, insisting rightly that "Holy Spirit" shall be used uniformly for "Holy Ghost." The Revisers' practice in this instance seems almost like a freak. Throughout Matt., Mk., and Luke, they render "Holy Ghost"

* Doubtless the word "candlestick" was retained for the sake of consistency with the word used in the Old Testament for the lampstand with its lamps in the Jewish sanctuary; but it is a pity that some other word could not have been adopted throughout, which would have kept the original image alike in the narrative and in the symbolism of a lamp with oil and conduits, instead of a candlestick, which was quite foreign to the writers' thought.

with "Spirit" in the margin; as also throughout Acts and Romans. In John, "Holy Spirit" throughout, except in xx. 22, where, for no apparent reason, "Holy Ghost," as A. V., is retained, with "Spirit" in the margin. In 1 Cor. vi. 19, "Holy Ghost," "Spirit" in the margin, but in 1 Cor. xii. 3, "Holy Spirit." In 2 Cor. "Holy Ghost" throughout, "Spirit" in the margin. In Eph. i. 13; iv. 30, "Holy Spirit." They could scarcely have said "Holy Ghost of promise" or "Holy Ghost of God." In 1 Thess. i. 5, 7, "Holy Ghost," with "Spirit" in the margin, but iv. 8, "Spirit." Timothy, Titus, Hebrews, 1st and 2d Peter, have "Holy Ghost" with "Spirit" in the margin, while Jude, 20, has "Holy Spirit."

"Blessed" is the rendering usually adopted for μακάριος. We clearly recognize the distinction between "happiness" and "blessedness": happiness being grounded in circumstances, and blessedness in character. This latter idea did not emphatically attach to μακάριος in Classical Greek;* but in the New Testament the word always carries a moral meaning, since the Gospel recognizes no well-being apart from holiness. Hence the word "blessed" might be safely used throughout, as it is in the majority of cases. Acts xxvi. 2 retains the A. V. "happy"; but "blessed" would have been true to Paul's deepest thought, which was not that in Agrippa he had a hearer who could appreciate his plea from a Jewish standpoint; but that, through Agrippa's intelligent hearing, there was a possibility of advantage to the Gospel through the justice which might be rendered to himself, its minister. "Blessed" would certainly be nearer to the sense in Rom. xiv. 22, where the A. V. "happy" is retained. The discourse here is all about conscience and Christian tolerance and faith. In 1 Cor. vii. 40, Paul is surely speaking of *spiritual* condition, when he says "the widow is *happier* (more blessed?) to abide as she is." In 1 Peter iii. 14; iv. 14, "happy" is well changed to "blessed"; but why not in the other cases? Consistency would have been easy.

The word ἐέλω, ἐθέλω, when used in the sense of "desire"

* Homer calls the gods μάκαρες, not because of their holy happiness, but because of their estate of ease and dignity; and Plato uses the word of the rich and cultured, and in congratulatory addresses. Theocritus has μακαρίτης and Æschylus μακαρίτης of the dead, or, as we would say, "the departed."

or "wish," has several different renderings, such as "will," "would," "desire," "please," "list." Matt. xiv. 5 retains "when he *would* have put him to death," while in Mark vi. 19, "*would have killed him*" is changed to "*desired to kill him*." If there must be a change then, why not have rendered in Matt. "and desiring" or "though he desired"? So in Gal. iv. 21, the A. V. is retained, "ye that *desire* to be under the law"; Gal. iv. 17, "they *would* exclude you" is changed to "they *desire*." Gal. i. 7 retains "they *would* pervert." Heb. xii. 17 changes "he *would* have inherited" to "he *desired* to inherit." Why not then, in Matt. xix. 27, "If thou *desirest* to enter"; and, 21, "if thou *desirest* to be perfect" for "if thou *wouldest*" (for A. V. "*wilt*"); and in Gal. i. 7, "they *desire* to pervert"? Again, we have at Matt. xviii. 23, "which *would* make a reckoning," as A. V.; but in Acts x. 10, Peter "*desired* to eat" for A. V. "*would have eaten*," which better conveys the force of the imperfect, he began to wish, according to the Revisers' own formula (conf. Luke i. 59).

Where ἐθέλω is used in the sense of consent, the Revision is consistent, and gives us several changes for the better. For instance, in Matt. xi. 14, we have "if ye *are willing* to receive it" for "if ye *will*"; in Matt. xxvi. 15, there is a subtle suggestion of some doubt, on Judas' part, of the liberality of the chief priests, conveyed by the rendering "what *are ye willing* to give me?" for A. V. "what *will* ye?" Similarly John vi. 21, where "they *willingly* received him," is changed to "they *were willing* to receive." All these instances carry in themselves the subordinate idea of *hesitation* on the part of those whose consent is asked. Thus, in the last one cited, the disciples, beholding Jesus walking on the sea toward them, were frightened, supposing Him to be a phantom; but when He spoke to them and they recognized Him, then "they were willing" to receive Him into the ship.

Again, the word ἐθέλω is used of *disposition*,—to have a mind. In John i. 43, we have for "Jesus *would* go forth," "*was minded* to go"; while in John vii. 44; Acts xiv. 13; xix. 33, "would have" is retained. Now we might say, "some *were minded* to take him"; the priests "*were minded* to do sacrifice"; Alexander "*was minded or disposed* to make his defence"; but, setting that question aside, the matter is

complicated by the use of "was minded" in several instances, for, *βουλευόμαι*; as in Acts v. 33, where "took counsel" is changed to "were minded," and Acts xv. 37, where we have "was minded" for "determined." Now *βουλευόμαι* carries the two meanings of *deliberation* and of *decision* after deliberation. Thus it may rightly be rendered "determine" or "purpose," as the Revisers twice render it in 2 Cor. i. 17; and therefore Acts xv. 37 might have remained as in A.V., "Barnabas *determined* (after deliberation) to go." "Was minded" expresses inclination rather than decision. Similarly no change was called for in Acts v. 33. "*Took counsel* to slay them," besides being a legitimate rendering of the verb, agrees with the facts in the case. The "council" and "senate" had been specially convoked to discuss the case of Peter and John; and they seriously *deliberated* about slaying them, and were only prevented from so deciding by the words of Gamaliel. Turning to Acts xxvii. 39, we find "were minded" changed to "took counsel." In 2 Cor. i. 15, 17, "was minded" might better have been changed to "purposed." It would have suited better the rendering "purpose" in ver. 17.

Once more, we find "was minded" as the translation of *φρονέω* in Gal. v. 10; Phil. iii. 15, and rightly, since *φρονέω* expresses the operation of the heart and will as well as that of the understanding, something as the English word "think" in certain cases.

Our conclusion, then, is that "to be minded" is not a good rendering for *βουλευόμαι*, for which we may choose between "take counsel," "consult," "determine," "purpose," which the Revisers themselves employ, and one of which would have covered every case where they have made the change to "was or is minded." Since they thus, however, unnecessarily use it for *βουλευόμαι* and rightly for *φρονέω*, it would be better not to use it for *ἐξέλω*; especially since they do not consistently use it in the cases cited, and to keep to "would have" as in the majority of instances.

Under the same head we notice the phrase "what shall I do?" where *ἐέλω* is used with the aorist subjunctive. In Mark xv. 12, *τί οὖν θέλετε ποιήσω* is rendered as A. V. "what shall I do?": In Luke xviii. 41, "what wilt thou that I should do?" (as A.V.) Luke xxii. 9, *ποῦ θέλεις ἐτοιμάσωμεν*, "where

wilt thou that we make ready?" (as A.V.) So Matt. xiii. 28 ; xxvii. 17 ; in both cases as A.V.

Now no objection can be taken to the rendering of the first four passages, bringing out as it does the sense of *volition* ; but why not then have changed Mark xv. 12 to "what will ye that I do," since Pilate's question about Jesus is directly addressed to the will or choice of the Jews? They had expressed their will to have Barabbas released ; now Pilate says, "What is your will concerning Christ?" This would be the more appropriate from the fact that in ver. 9, the rendering of the A.V. is rightly retained—"Will ye that I release unto you."

We come now to note some cases where consistency has been restored or preserved. *Σκανδαλίζω* is uniformly rendered by "stumble" instead of "offend," either in the text or in the margin. In Matt. xxvi. 33, the use of "stumble" would occasion such an awkward circumlocution, that the rendering of the A. V. is wisely retained. *Πλοῖον* is consistently changed from "ship" to "boat" throughout the Gospels ; but "ship" is resumed in Acts and in James, where "boat" would be manifestly inappropriate. *Λύχνος*, habitually and wrongly rendered in A. V. "candle" or "light," is throughout changed to "lamp." *στενός*, A. V. "strait," is changed in all the three passages to "narrow." *οὐρανός*, rendered in eleven places "air" or "sky" by the A. V. is consistently rendered "heaven" throughout. So, the very awkward "coasts" for *ὅρια* is everywhere changed to "borders." *υἱός*, which, in the A. V. is so often rendered "child," has its rightful meaning, "son," restored in every case.* *καταγγέλλω* is rendered "proclaim," where the A.V. varies between "preach," "shew," "teach," "declare," "speak of." Exceptions are found in Acts xvi. 21 ; xvii. 23, where "set forth" is adopted. In the latter passage the Revisers have, apparently, followed the hint of Archbishop Trench (on the Authorized Version, pp. 81-2), and have changed the word to suit the hapaxlegomenon *καταγγελεύς*, "setter forth." Paul gives back their own word—"him *set I forth* (*καταγγέλλω*) unto you." In the former case, "proclaim" might have been used, though the word includes the

* Excepting, of course, in the phrase "children of Israel," and in Acts xiii. 26, "Children of the stock of Abraham," which comes under the same head ; and in Matt. xxi. 5, where, obviously, it is better to retain "foal."

apostles' demonstration by *act*, in healing the possessed damsel, as well as their preaching.

A clear distinction, not observed in the A. V., is maintained in the case of ὄχλος. Πολύς ὄχλος is always rendered "a great multitude"; ὁ ὄχλος πολὺς, "the common people"; and ὄχλος ἱκανός, "much people." τάφος, which the A. V. once renders "tomb," is "sepulchre" throughout, and μνημεῖον, which in the A. V. is indiscriminately "grave," "tomb," "sepulchre," is invariably "tomb."

SYNONYMS.

It is worthy of notice that the Revisers have avoided at this point the temptation to express subtle distinctions at the sacrifice of conciseness and perspicuity; and they have shown their care and judgment quite as much in what they have omitted as in what they have inserted. A few illustrations will be interesting.

Great pains have been taken to distinguish the five different words for servant, δοῦλος, θεράπων, διάκονος, οἰκέτης, and ὑπηρέτης, although our language does not afford the means for accurate distinction in the text without circumlocution. δοῦλος, though translated "servant," always has "bondservant" in the margin, a servant or slave as distinguished from a free man. διάκονος, which emphasizes the servant's activity, is rendered either "servant" or "minister," but with the alternate meaning in the margin. In John ii. 5, where διακόνους refers to the attendants generally without regard to their condition as free or slaves, it is servants (as A. V.) without marginal comment. In rendering the kindred word διακονία, "ministry," "ministration," "administration," are pretty strictly adhered to; "office" being changed to "ministry" in Rom. xi. 13, and "service" to "ministration," Rom. xv. 31, and to "ministry" Rev. ii. 19. Rather strangely, in 1 Tim. i. 12, "putting me into the ministry" is altered to "appointing me to his service"; where, as διακονία is anarthrous, "appointing me unto ministry" might have been read. Neither can we see sufficient reason for changing "sent forth to minister," Heb. i. 14, to "sent forth for service," when it might as well have been "sent forth for ministry" (conf. διακονῆσαι, Mark x. 45, "to minister"). In Matt. xxii. the special case cited by Trench (N. T. Synonyms, sub δοῦλος),

we have, ver. 3, of those who were sent to invite the guests, *δούλους*; "servants," with "bondservants" in the margin; and in ver. 13, of those who were commissioned to cast out the intruder, *διακόνους*, "servants," with "ministers" in the margin. *οἰκέτης*, "a household servant," is also recognized in the margin in three instances of its occurrence, and in the fourth, Acts x. 7, is retained in the text from A. V. *ὑπηρέτης*, a servant representing certain functions, as a rower, a herald, an orderly, necessarily implies a variety of rendering according to circumstances. It is most frequently rendered "officer." In Luke iv. 20, of the person waiting upon the reader in the synagogue, "minister" is changed to "attendant." The same change occurs in Acts xiii. 5, of Mark as the attendant of Paul and Barnabas, with certain defined duties. In Acts xxvi. 16, 1 Cor. iv. 1, "minister" is retained in the restricted sense in which the term is used of preachers of the Gospel.

εἰκών, the "image" as a reflection or reproduction of its prototype, is carefully distinguished from *ὁμοίωμα*, a "likeness," which may be accidental. A good illustration of this is found in Rom. i. 23, where the two words occur, and where the A. V. reads, "An image made like to corruptible man." This is changed to "the likeness of an image," since the heathen idol was not an *image* even of corruptible man, but only a faint *likeness*.

In the case of words signifying "to touch," *ψηλαφάω*, *σιγγάνω*, *ἅπτομαι*,—it is perhaps impossible to convey the exact sense of *ψηλαφάω*, the main point of which, according to Trench, is to exclude the idea of so touching or handling as to exert a modifying influence. Hence the A. V. has wisely been left unchanged, except in Heb. xii. 18, where the margin indicates that the distinction has been recognized, and that the Revisers have guarded against the wrong interpretation "touched by the fire of God." As between *ἅπτεσθαι* and *σιγγάνειν*, which convey the idea which *ψηλαφάω* excludes, the difference is not great; but *ἅπτεσθαι* is the stronger word of the two.* This has been recognized by rendering Col. ii. 21,

* As is shown by Lightfoot (Comm. on Colossians ii. 21), "from the fact that it frequently suggests, though it does not necessarily involve, the idea of voluntary or conscious effort—to take hold of—a suggestion which is entirely wanting to the colorless word *σιγγάνειν*."

“handle not, nor taste, nor touch”; thus, as Trench observes, bringing out “the ascending scale of superstitious prohibition.”

In all cases, *διάδημα*, the kingly crown as distinguished from the chaplet, is rendered by “diadem,” leaving “crown” for *στέφανος*, the victor’s crown.

ἀσέλγεια, “wanton caprice,” and *ἄσωτία*, riotous excess, are kept distinct by using “lasciviousness” for *ἀσέλγεια*; “filthy conversation” in 2 Pet. ii. 7, being changed to “lascivious life,” though “wantonness” is retained in Rom. xiii. 13. *ἄσωτία*, in all three instances, is rendered “riot,” “excess” being altered in Eph. v. 18, and the A. V. being retained in the others.

This is an interesting field, but we must leave it for others more important.*

TENSES.

We pass now to notice the tenses, which reveal some of the most careful and valuable work of the Revisers.

THE PRESENT TENSE is restored to its own inheritance. Every reader of the Greek Testament knows that, in narrative especially, the present is often introduced suddenly into a group of aorists. Thus John ix. 13, “they *bring* (A. V. “brought”) to the Pharisees him that aforetime was blind”; John xviii. 28, “then *lead* they Jesus,” A. V. “led”); John xix. 9; Acts x. 11; Mark vi. 1; Matt. iii. 15, 16; Mark xiv. 53; Heb. ix. 6, 7, 9. In a number of cases the A. V. is right, and is of course retained. The important distinction referred to by Lightfoot (On a Fresh Revision), according to which salvation is treated by Paul as a thing of the past, the present and the future, and with a corresponding change of tense, is observed in the Revision, and the idea of salvation as a “progressive condition, a present state,” is therefore restored in Acts ii. 47 by the change of “should be saved” to “were being saved,” *σωζομένους*. So in 1 Cor. i. 18; 2 Cor. ii. 15. In

* The reader will find it interesting to examine, among many other illustrations, the renderings of *βόσκη* “to feed,” and the larger word *ποιμαίνω*, which includes all the offices of a shepherd, especially at John xxi. 15, 17. *πᾶρεσις*, “prætermission,” and *ἄφεσις*, “remission.” *λατρεῖω*, “general service,” and *λειτουργίῳ*, “service in a special office or function.” *δειλία* “cowardice,” and *φόβος* “fear.” *αἰγιαλός*, “the beach,” that over which *ἁλς*, “the sea,” *ἰσσει*, “rushes,” and *ἁκτὴ*, never used in the New Testament, “the shore,” that on which the sea “breaks” (*ἄγνυμι*).

1 Cor. xv. 2, however, "ye are saved," σωζεσθε is retained. In Heb. ix. 6, 7, 9, where the writer is speaking to Jews of ordinances still in force, we have the present tense and the correct alteration of "went," "offered," "were offered," to "go," "offereth," "are offered." Several cases should be especially noted in which the Revisers improve upon the A. V. by bringing out the sense of continuous action in the present, which, strictly, is its proper sense. Thus 1 John ii. 8, we have for "the darkness is past," "the darkness is passing away." We might ask why the next clause might not likewise be rendered "the true light is already shining," instead of "shineth"; and it is a great pity that by retaining the rendering of the A. V. in ver. 17, the force of παράγεται, expressing something in actual progress, is somewhat weakened. "The world is passing away" would be an improvement on "passeth away." In Matt. xxi. 16, the narrative gains greatly in vividness by this rendering of the present. While the children are still crying in the temple, the priests and scribes turn to Jesus with the words, "Hearest thou what these *are saying*," even while we speak? Thus as it seems to us, it would have been better to render at Matt. xi. 5, "the blind *are receiving*, the lame *are walking*," etc., while the Saviour speaks, and while poor John is in a tumult of doubt. In Matt. xxv. 8, for "our lamps are gone out," we have the correct rendering "are going out." The foolish virgins on awaking have tried to kindle them. The flame has burned feebly for a moment with the last drops of the oil, and as they now see it sinking they cry, "our lamps *are going* out." Rom. viii. 28 loses we think by retaining "work together," instead of reading "all things *are working* together for good," even now, while they seem to be working for evil, and while the Christian is tempted to say, like Jacob, "all these things are against me." Also in Matt. xiii. 19, this force of the present is at least worth considering: "While anyone *is hearing* the word of the kingdom and not understanding it, the evil one *is coming* and *snatching away* that which is sown in his heart," as fast as it is sown: such a rendering brings out more vividly the fact that Satan does not even suffer the word to lie, but snatches it away even while it is being heard. We are disposed to think that the Revisers might profitably have given more attention to this point; for

though the present cannot always be rendered in this way, and though it is used to express a general truth no less than a fact in actual progress, yet the general truth not unfrequently lies in the writer's mind as an image; as in 1 John ii. 8, where the apostle's imagination beholds the shadows vanishing before the dawning light; and to transfer this image to the English version is greatly to enhance the vividness of the passage, as well as to reproduce the thought more nearly as it was conceived.

The King James translators, as is very well known, were habitually indifferent to the sense of the IMPERFECT TENSE as expressing action in past time, either in process of accomplishment, or in process of conception in the agent's mind; and here also the Revisers have done very valuable work. Thus they give us, John x. 23, "Jesus was walking," for "walked"; John iv. 1, "John was making and baptizing" for "made and baptized"; iv. 27, "was speaking" for "talked"; iv. 30, "were coming" for "came." How the right rendering of the imperfect, in this last passage, lights up the narrative. For the bare statement of the fact that the Samaritans "came to him," we have a picture; we see them pouring out from the city, and hurrying toward the well; and, while they are coming, "*in the meanwhile* (v. 31), the disciples *were* praying *him*, ἡρώτων, Master, eat."* At Luke i. 22, where half the power of the narrative is lost by the insipid rendering of the A. V. "he beckoned unto them," the Revision restores it by correctly rendering the imperfect with the present participle, ἦν διαρεῖν, a peculiarly forcible way of expressing a continued state or act—"he continued making signs." In Luke viii. 29 we think the retention of the A. V. unfortunate. In ver. 28 we have the possessed man adjuring Jesus not to torment him. In ver. 29 we have the explanation of this strange entreaty. Jesus *was commanding* the unclean spirit to come out; and, just as in the case of the epileptic child at the Transfiguration Mount, the spirit, compelled to depart, wreaked his malice on the man. The reading of the A. V. "commanded," obscures the sense which the imperfect was meant to express—of the *simultaneousness* of Christ's exorcism, the final outbreak

* How could the Revisers have overlooked *this* latter imperfect which so admirably suits the context, and have retained "prayed him"?

of demoniac rage, and the man's cry, "torment me not." Again, in Luke v. 6 we have "were breaking" for "brake." Trench's suggestion here is very happy: "were at the point to break." A valuable change is also made at Mark ii. 18, "were fasting" for "used to fast," where the reference is not to a *custom*, but to an *act* then in progress.

Similarly, where the progress of the conception in the agent's mind is expressed, the Revisers have been careful to mark the force of the imperfect. In Luke i. 59, for instance, the A.V. makes a wrong statement by the rendering "they *called* the child Zacharias," which they did not do, because the mother forbade them. The Greek, however, plainly states the case by the imperfect—"they would have called," for which we could almost wish that Bishop Lightfoot's suggestion had been adopted, "they were for calling." Similarly the A.V. of Matt. iii. 14 states what was not the fact, in reading "John forbade him." John did *not* forbid Jesus to be baptized; but *he had it in mind* to hinder him; and so the Rev. reads "would have hindered him." In Gal. iv. 20 we are glad to find "I could wish" for "I desire," the imperfect implying that the wish itself is impossible in the existing state of things; and similarly at Acts xxv. 22, we have "I could wish to hear" for "I would hear."

But the severest test of the Revisers' work among the tenses develops in their dealing with THE AORIST, as might be expected of a tense which plays so large and varied a part in such a language as the Greek.*

Let us begin with the simplest and most familiar function of this tense, that of describing "the simple occurrence of an event at some past time, considered as a momentary act." ("Winer, N. T. Gram.," p. 331).

It is well known that, at this point, the translators of 1611 are habitually at fault, ignoring the distinction between this tense and the perfect, which expresses past action perpetuated by its consequences in the present. Thus Acts xix. 2, ἐλάβετε, "did ye receive," is rendered "have ye received"; while, contrariwise, Luke xiii. 2, πεπόνθασιν, is rendered "they suffered"

* In this portion of the article I wish to acknowledge my obligations to the three valuable papers of the Rev. Joseph Agar Beet, in the eleventh volume of "The Expositor," 1st series, on "The Greek Aorist as used in the New Testament."

for "they have suffered." In many such places we find that the Revisers have been at work; see, for instance, Matt. vii. 22; John vi. 49; Matt. ii. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 2; 2 Cor. v. 14; Rom. vi. 2, 8, 17, with a multitude of others.

But this simple and definite conception of the aorist can by no means be applied as a universal test to the uses of this tense. The perfect, as we have seen, is radically distinguished from the aorist by the *abiding result* of the action; consequently, its derivative tense, the pluperfect, preserves this distinction. "The Greeks," to quote Mr. Beet, "used the pluperfect only when they wished to say that, previous to some time mentioned or suggested, an event *had taken place*, of which the results still continued at the time referred to." Thus John xi. 19, "Many of the Jews *had come* to console," and were there when Jesus arrived. When, therefore, it is desired to express merely that an event had taken place previous to some time mentioned without implying any abiding result at the time referred to, the Greeks use the aorist for the pluperfect; but this aorist must, nevertheless, be rendered by the English pluperfect. Thus Luke ii. 39, *ὡς ἐτέλεσαν*, is rendered, "when they *had* accomplished,—they returned"; the performance of the legal ceremony not perpetuating itself in their return: Luke vii. 1, *ἐπειδὴ ἐπλήρωσεν*, "after he *had ended* all his sayings, he entered into Capernaum": John xiii. 12, *ὅτε ἔνιψεν τοὺς πόδας*, "when he *had washed* their feet, he asked them." See also Mark vi. 17, 18, 30; and Mark vi. 7. By a happy accident, we may suppose, or by natural instinct, for correctness in the use of the aorist could be little else with the King James translators, the A. V., in most of the cases we have cited, needs no change. In John iv. 46 it is a fair question whether "he *had* made" should not be substituted for "he made"; if there is any ground anywhere for such translation of the aorist, it is there. So in John vi. 22, the aoristic rendering of *συνεισῆλθεν* and *ἀπῆλθεν* has been retained, though the words refer to the inference drawn by the multitude which was seeking Jesus, concerning His movements of the past night. They perceived that He *had* not entered into the boat with His disciples, and that His disciples *had* gone away alone. (*Vid.* "Moulton's Winer, N. T. Gram.," p. 343).

Again, we find it necessary sometimes to render the aorist

as a present. As Farrar, in his "Greek Syntax," observes, "Owing to the use of the past aorist to supply the absence of any present aorist, many past aorists have acquired a present sense."* At Jas. i. 11, therefore, we have "arisseth" for "is risen"; the remaining aorists in the passage being correctly rendered in the A. V., as they are also in v. 24, and in 1 Pet. i. 24.† In John xv. 8, the A. V. is followed, "is glorified," with "was" in the margin. In Matt. iii. 17; xii. 18; xvii. 5; 2 Pet. i. 17, the phrase ἐν ᾧ ἡ εὐδόκησα retains the A. V., "I am well pleased."

Let us look now at the aorist participle with a finite verb. For the aorist participle we have no exact equivalent in English. For ἰδὼν ἀπῆλθεν, for instance, we may say "seeing, or on seeing he departed," or "having seen he departed," or "he saw and departed"; but not "when he had seen he departed," which is a Latinism. The Revisers, therefore, render Matt. xxii. 25, "the first married and deceased" (why retain that "deceased"?) for "when he had married deceased"; Acts v. 10, as A. V. "came in and found her"; xx. 17, as A. V. "sent and called." At Luke xxiii. 46, the American Committee justly insist that margin and text change places. The Revised text follows the A. V.; "and when Jesus had cried, he said," where it should read as in the margin, "and Jesus crying—said." The former reading makes Jesus first utter an inarticulate cry, and afterward utter the words "Father, into thy hands," etc. Whereas the loud cry was probably the utterance of these words. In Acts v. 30, the A. V. "ye slew and hanged on a tree," conveys the meaning that Christ was first slain and then crucified; which the Rev., of course, corrects by rendering "whom ye slew, hanging him" (*i. e.* by hanging).

Winer observes that "there is no passage in which it can certainly be proved that the aorist stands for the perfect"; but it remains true, nevertheless, that the aorist must sometimes be translated by the English perfect.‡ Where we have evi-

* Winer, N. T. Gram., p. 346, positively asserts that the aorist in the N. T. never expresses an habitual act; which, however, is denied by Buttmann, *vid.* note 2, p. 347.

† In Mark xi. 24, the American Committee properly object to the rendering of the second aorist, ἐλάβετε by "have received," and substitute "receive" of the A. V. with "received" in the margin.

‡ Bishop Ellicott, in his admirable note on 1 Thess. ii. 16 (Trans.), observes of ἐφθασεν which he renders as a perfect, "is come," that the English aorist does not

dence that any effect of the action expressed by the aorist remains, we are justified in rendering it by a perfect ; for, as Mr. Beet observes, " the aorist by no means implies that the consequences of the event do not remain to the present ; and if the context made it sufficiently clear that the consequences continued, or if it was needless to call special attention to them, the aorist was used. Only when the consequences demanded attention was the perfect used." Take, for instance, Luke xiv. 18. The man invited to the wedding says ἡγόρασα, where both A. V. and Rev. render " I have bought." The time of buying is not defined, but the context shows that the buying affected his reception of the invitation. So Rom. iii. 12, " have turned aside," " are become unprofitable," where the results appear in the succeeding verses ; Phil. iv. 2, " I have learned," the consequences appearing in ver. 12. On this principle the ἀφίκαμεν of Matt. vi. 12, is rendered " we have forgiven," for A. V. " we forgive " (which, however, follows the reading ἀφιέμεν), the forgiveness of others being already complete when we ask pardon for ourselves, yet having its consequences as a condition of our being forgiven by God (conf. ver. 14).*

Similarly the English perfect is required to render the aorist in negative sentences " where the entire past up to the present moment is covered." Thus, Matt. viii. 10, οὐδὲ εἶρον is " I have not found," as A. V. ; 1 John iii. 2, " is not yet made manifest," for " doth not appear " ; 1 Tim. vi. 16, " hath seen," as A. V. ; Mark x. 20, a very good example ; " I *have observed* these commandments from my youth to the present hour." At 1 Cor. ii. 9, εἶδεν, ἤκουσεν are rendered aoristically, changing the A. V. " hath seen," " hath heard," to " saw," " heard " ; to which there can be no objection, as the quotation is treated as parenthetical, and, therefore, independent of the temporal connections of the rest of the pas-

convey the full force of the Greek, but remands the event too unequivocally to the past. While the Greek ἐβόασεν states the fact, but is simply *silent* as to *quam late pateat id quod actum est*, the English " came " seems to *express* it, and to imply too distinctly that the event plainly belongs with all its issues to the past.

* Even Homer now and then nods, and Bishop Ellicott (Revision of the New Testament, p. 122, note) adopts the reading ἀφίκαμεν, calling it a *perfect*, in which he is followed by Professor Milligan, also of the New Testament Committee, in his paper on " Some Recent Critical Readings in the New Testament " (Expositor, Vol. VII., First Series, p. 130).

sage; but ver. 10 resumes the temporal connection, the key to which is given by the present at ver. 6—"we speak." Hence, "we speak the wisdom of God," and "God *hath* revealed" (*ἀπεκάλυψεν*) this wisdom, hidden from the princes of this world, unto us. The time indeed of this revelation is not defined, but the consequences of it are seen in our speaking. Hence, we think the rendering of the A. V. better than the Revision rendering "revealed."

A few words may be said of the use of the aorist in correspondence, where the writer of a letter regards the time of writing or sending as his correspondent will do when he shall have received it. Thus, we should say in our letter, "I write," or "I send"; but Paul, writing to Philemon, says: *ἀνέπεμψα*, since, to Philemon, the act of sending would be already past. Hence, we may render the aorists, *ἔγραψα*, *ἔπεμψα*, *ἀνέπεμψα* as presents. The A. V. commonly employs the perfect, to which, in the case of *ἔπεμψα* and *ἀνέπεμψα* the Revisers adhere throughout, changing at Phil. ii. 28 "sent" to "have sent." For *ἔγραψα* they usually render "I write," for "I have written" or "I wrote." We see no special reason why 1 Pet. v. 12 should retain "have written," while Rom. xv. 15 changes it to "write." In both cases the reference is to the Epistle just concluded. Passages like Gal. vi. 11; 1 Cor. v. 11; and 1 John ii. 14, involve disputed questions—as whether Paul at the close of the Galatian letter takes the pen into his own hand (so Lightfoot and Meyer) and alludes to the concluding autograph, or whether *ἔγραψα* refers to the whole preceding Epistle written with his own hand (so Elliott and Alford). Or, in 1 Cor. v. 11, whether the reference is to the letter which Paul is now writing, or to that to which he refers in ver. 9. Here the American Committee very properly dissent from the Revised rendering, and adopt the marginal reading, "as it is I wrote," referring to the letter of ver. 9.*

It is a fact worth noting that, in these subtler uses of the aorist, the Revisers, so far as we have observed, have found fewer changes necessary than where the simpler and broader laws of the tense are involved; as in the case of the distinc-

* See Winer, N. T. Grammar, p. 579, note on the logical sense of *νῦν*, and conf. Elliott on 1 Thess. iii. 8.

tions between the aorist and the perfect or imperfect. One is almost disposed to apply here the words of Bishop Ellicott respecting the particles, that "their general force has been observed in our Authorized Version, if not on principles of strict grammatical precision, yet with an instinctive feeling for their essential meanings." (Revision of the N. T., p. 97).

We are compelled to pass over very briefly the handling of the perfect tense. We merely note a few cases where its proper rendering greatly improves and deepens the meaning. Bearing in mind the fact that this tense represents jointly the past event and its present result, we find, Matt. i. 22, *τοῦτο γέγονεν*, "this *is* come to pass," for "was done," where the aoristic rendering entirely leaves out the impression which the perfect directly conveyed to a Greek reader, that the event had left its mark on the world. So in Matt. xxv. 26, we have for "there was a cry made," "there is a cry," *κραυγὴ γέγονεν*, from which a Greek would have caught at once the sense of a great and decisive change made by this cry. The sleeping, the waiting, the silence and darkness—all have vanished. "There is a cry," and behold the awaking, the bustle, the trimming of the lamps, and the begging for oil. In 2 Cor. i. 9, *ἐσχίκαμεν*, we read, "we *have had* the answer of death," for "we had": it is the word of one in whom the effect of this answer abides. In Heb. xi. 17, 28, where the line between the aorist and the perfect is very delicate, the Revisers show that they have not lost sight of it. "Offered up" and "he kept" are retained, but "hath offered" and "hath made" are placed in the margin.

In Rev. v. 7 we find the nice distinction of tenses observed. The angel "came," an instantaneous act, *ἦλθεν*, and "taketh," *εἵληφεν*, the book, *i. e.*, took and held it. The A. V. has "took," and the Revisers' margin reads "Gr. hath taken." See also Rev. viii. 5.

Once more look at 2 Cor. xii. 9, where *εἶρηκεν* is rendered "he hath said," for A. V. "said"; a change which grates a little on the ear, until we realize that more is conveyed by this tense than the mere fact that the Lord spoke to Paul. It shows that in Paul's mind there was lying when he wrote these words, not only the memory of the incident, but the deep sense of the abiding power and value of Christ's grace

in his life ; so that because the Lord *hath said*, "My grace is sufficient for thee," Paul can now say, "Wherefore I take pleasure in weakness," etc., "*for Christ's sake* ; for when I am weak, then am I strong." A more beautiful use of the perfect can hardly be found in the New Testament.

METAPHORS.

In the writings of Paul, especially, and more or less throughout the New Testament, we find many picture-words. There is a sense of Scripture, truthful as far as it goes, which an English reader receives from a faithful translation, but there is also a deeper-lying class of impressions which appeal only to the careful reader of the original. A word often tells the story of its own origin. We look into it as into a pellucid water, which not only bears up our boat, but reveals through its clear depths the pulsations of the springs which feed it. Thus, while a word may suffice for ordinary interchange or for conveying the substance of truth, it may at the same time tell us a good deal about itself, and carry with it a line of suggestions parallel to those awakened by the truth. The misfortune is that so few, comparatively, of these treasures can be made available in a manual like the Bible. Bible students are under endless obligations to scholars like Trench and Lightfoot and Howson, who have unearthed so many of them ; yet, for the greater part of them, the English reader must still depend upon the pulpit and the commentary.* The Revisers, however, have not overlooked this matter, and have made numerous changes with great advantage to the picturesqueness and liveliness of the Version. Thus, in Phil. v. 30, *παρὰ βολὴν σώμενος* is happily altered from "not regarding" to "hazarding," the word being really much stronger even than this, "having *gambled* with his life," and thus expressing the reckless devotion with which Epaphroditus threw himself into Paul's service. Again at iv. 7, "guard" is an improvement

* Thus, it would be well-nigh impossible to convey into a word or a compact phrase the picture in *τετραηλισμένῳ*, Heb. iv. 13, the picture of the victim's throat drawn back and exposed to the stroke of the knife. It is a powerful figure to represent the complete exposure of the heart to the sword of the Spirit, and the perfect consistency of the whole passage is not wholly apparent without the understanding of the figure. If we might have "laid bare" instead of "laid open," without trenching on the sense of *γυμνῶ*, there would be an approach to the picture.

upon "keep," since it brings out the beautiful figure in *φρουρήσει*, of the peace of God like a sentinel mounting guard over a believer's heart. So in ver. 12, the English reader might at first think the change from "I am instructed" to "I have learned the secret" forced and unnecessary, until he should be told that the Greek word literally means "to be initiated," as into mysteries, and should see its etymological connection with *μυστήρια*, so often used by Paul with reference to revealed truths.

In 1 Cor. ix. 27, the A. V. "keep under" is exceedingly tame, and out of keeping with the setting of the whole passage, which is that of the arena, with its runners and boxers. The Revised rendering of *ὕπωπιάζω*, "buffet," is an improvement; though it is a question whether the marginal "bruise" might not on the whole be better in the text with the literal translation, "to strike under the eye," in the margin as an explanation, not as an alternative reading. Thus rendered, this boxer's word falls in with the imagery of the whole passage.*

In Col. ii. 5, "order" is retained for *τάξιν*, which is a military term, as is also *στερέωμα*, "a solid front" or "close phalanx," for which "steadfastness" is retained. We should better like for the former Bishop Lightfoot's rendering, "your orderly array"; and "steadfastness" hardly expresses *στερέωμα*, which is rather compact solidity. The reader may also refer to *καταναρμῶν* (2 Cor. xi. 9 and xii. 13, 14), where "to be a burden" is substituted for "to be chargeable"; Gal. iii. 1, where the figure of a public notice or placard in *προεγράφη* could hardly be conveyed into the translation without awkwardness; Gal. iii. 23, where "kept in ward" for *ἐφρουρούμεθα* is a marked improvement on "kept" (conf. Phil. iv. 7 above); Gal. vi. 17, where, by the introduction of "branded," the peculiar sense of *στίγματα* is expressed, and the terrible intensity of the Apostle's thought preserved; and *δριαμβεύω* in Col. ii. 15, 2 Cor. ii. 14, a battle-ground of exegesis.†

* In Luke xviii. 5, the same word is rendered "wear out," for "weary" of A. V.; but here it has no context which requires the maintenance of the figure, and has dropped from its metaphorical into its familiar usage, where, as in so many other cases, the attempt to preserve the figure on etymological grounds would savor of pedantry.

† See a very elaborate and ingenious paper on "Paul's Use of *δριαμβεύω*," by the Rev. George Findlay, B.A., in "The Expositor," first series, Vol. X., p. 403.

THE ARTICLE.

At this point where the A. V. is so justly open to criticism, the Revisers have meted out changes with a liberal hand. They restore, for instance, the distinction which the A.V. entirely ignores, between *Χριστός*, the individual, generally recognized as Messiah, and *ὁ χριστός*, the official title of the Messiah, "who might or might not be identified with the person Jesus, according to the spiritual discernment of the individual." Thus in Matt. xi. 2, the insertion of the article changes the whole conception of the passage. John had heard the works of *the* Christ; not merely that Jesus was doing certain works, but that works were being done which were the appropriate works of the Messiah as foretold by the prophets. Hence his question gains fresh point: "art *thou* (σὺ emphatic) he that cometh?" Where the article is not used, the reasons are easily seen. In Mark ix. 41, Christ is speaking of Himself, and therefore uses His own name from the point of full recognition. In Luke ii. 11, the angels speak of Him from the same point. In Luke xxiii. 2, Christ's description of Himself is quoted. In John i. 17 we have a comment of the Evangelist; and in John iv. 25, the woman speaks the voice of current Messianic tradition. In the Epistles the word is used both with and without the article. In the Epistles of Paul and Peter, where it is dependent on a preceding noun, and often in the nominative, it takes the article; but in these cases, so far as we have observed, the Revisers pay no attention to the fact.

As might have been expected, the article is restored in Rom. v. 15, 19, with *εἷς* and *πολλοί*, so as to read "the one," "the many"; on which Bentley's often-quoted words are worth quoting again:

"By this accurate version some hurtful mistakes about partial redemption and absolute reprobation had been happily prevented. Our English readers had then seen what several of the fathers saw and testified, that "*the many*" in antithesis to "*the one*" are equivalent to "*all*" in v. 12, and comprehend the whole multitude, the entire species of mankind, exclusive only of the one."*

* This is not the place to enter into the much-vexed question as to the meaning of *νόμος* with and without the article. It seems very clear that no sharp distinction can be drawn. There can be no reasonable doubt that the anarthrous *νόμος* is used of the law of Moses, no less than *νόμος* with the article. The case seems to be correctly stated by Cremer (Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek): "The article is usually wanting where stress is laid, not upon its historical impress and outward form, but

We note a few out of a multitude of passages corrected by the insertion or omission of the article according to the Greek. Matt. xxiv. 2, "the love of *the* many," giving the true sense of the "majority"; Matt. xxi. 12, Mk. xi. 15, "the doves"; pointing the reference to those sold for sacrifice in the temple court; Matt. v. 1, "the mountain," of a familiar point above the lake of Galilee; Mark xiv. 69, "the maid servant"; the same that spoke to Peter the first time, while the A. V. leaves us to infer that it was another; Matt. xxiv. 32, "her parable," the peculiar lesson belonging to the fig-tree; John iii. 10, "the teacher of Israel": the well-known, famous teacher; thus strengthening the expression of surprise at Nicodemus' ignorance; Luke vii. 5, "our synagogue," the one building familiar to the whole Jewish community; John iv. 27, "a woman" for "the woman." The disciples were not wondering at Christ's talking with that particular woman, but with *any* woman in that public place. John v. 44, "the only God," laying the emphasis on God as God *alone*, and on the honor as taking its character from that fact; and not on the fact that the honor can be had from only one source. John v. 35, "the lamp that burneth and shineth"; the second $\acute{o}$ pointing to the characteristics of a lamp as contrasted with those of the light. We wish they had rendered *καίόμενος* "which is kindled." John vi. 31, "the manna," referring to a familiar fact. Phil. i. 23, "betwixt the two," where the article has a very nice definitive force, marking the alternative in Paul's mind: "I am in a strait betwixt *the* two,—departing and abiding." Phil. iii. 20, "a Saviour *the* Lord Jesus." By omitting the definite article before "Saviour," we restore the progress of thought from the gen-

upon the conception itself"; or, as Bishop Lightfoot (on Gal. ii. 19): "law considered as a principle, exemplified no doubt chiefly and signally in the Mosaic law, but very much wider than this in its application." The A. V., so far as any such distinction is made by the article, has ignored it. The Revisers, while recognizing the distinction, have dealt cautiously with it, and wisely as we think, generally following the A. V. in the retention of the article, and that in numerous cases where the Greek word is anarthrous. In a few cases where the more general and comprehensive sense is evident, such as Rom. ii. 12, 13, 14; vi. 14, 15; vii. 2; James ii. 12,—we find "law" or "a law" for "the law." In some other cases where there is a fair question as between the general and the special sense, as Rom. ii. 23; v. 20; vii. 1, 7, 9; xiii. 10; Gal. ii. 16, 19, 21; iii. 2, 5, 10; vi. 13; Heb. vii. 12,—"law" or "a law," is inserted in the margin. At Rom. vii. 21, "a law" is changed to "the law," according to the Greek. In Rom. ii. 23, Gal. vi. 13 the marginal reading seems to us uncalled for, since the context, in both cases, points clearly to the Mosaic law.

cral to the particular. We, citizens of heaven, expect *a* Saviour from our earthly bondage, and that Saviour *the* Lord Jesus. Phil. i. 14, "most of the brethren." By rendering τοὺς before πλείονας, we state the real degree of success which had attended Paul's ministry in Rome. Not only many, but *the more part, most* of the brethren had been emboldened. Col. i. 19, "*the* fulness," where the article gives us the technical word, applying the familiar Gnostic term to Christ. Acts ix. 2; xix. 9; xix. 23; xxiv. 22; "the way." By thus substituting "the" for "this" and "that," we have the term "way" as a recognized proper name for the Gospel, and bring these passages into harmony with John xiv. 5, 6. Phil. ii. 9: "the name above every name," is an improvement which speaks for itself. Rom. xii. 9; a very important change from "wrath" regarded as a sinful passion to be avoided,—to "*the* wrath," an accepted term for the *divine* wrath. It may be farther observed that "give place" suits this latter meaning far better than that of the A. V. "Give place unto wrath," in the commonly accepted sense, would seem to mean, "get out of the way of wrath"; but its plain, surface meaning is—"give room for wrath to exercise itself." With the restoration of the article this sense is perfectly natural, and much more in harmony with the context, and we incline to the view that this was the sense intended in the A. V., though obscured by the habitual neglect of the article. Thus we shall have, "avenge not yourselves, but leave vengeance to the divine wrath, since it is written, Vengeance is mine," etc. The American Committee have thus good grounds for insisting on the transfer of this rendering from the margin to the text. 1 Tim. iii. 11, "women," instead of "their wives." The high authority of Huther is for the A. V., but the great preponderance of both authority and argument is in favor of the new rendering, which refers, most probably, to deaconesses. Phil. iv. 17. The restoration of the article—"the gift"—defines the reference to the donation alluded to in ver. 16. 1 Tim. vi. 10, "*a* root" for "*the* root," corrects a false statement.

It would surprise any reader unfamiliar with the original, to see how much light is thrown upon the text, and how much life is imparted to argument, exhortation, and narrative, by simple fidelity to the Greek in the omission or insertion of

this little but potent instrument of speech. If the Revisers had done nothing else, they would have rendered, by their dealing with the article, an invaluable service to English Bible-readers.

NEW RENDERINGS.

Much which properly belongs to this head has been, necessarily, discussed in other parts of this paper. It is impossible to compare critically the two versions, without an almost oppressive sense of the immense and minute labor bestowed upon this latest revision. These Revisers have not been satisfied to deal merely with the larger masses of their work. Like the old cathedral builders, who did not spare their elaborate traceries in obscure nooks where human eye would never see them, but who built and carved for the scrutiny of a more searching eye,—the hands of these Christian scholars have been busy upon corners where only the professional student rummages, and where they will receive neither appreciation nor thanks from the great body of English readers. Nay, a large share of complaint will be vented at this point, from hundreds who are unaccustomed to think or speak accurately themselves, and to whom, provided the word contains some approach to the sense, any change, and especially smaller changes, appeal as senseless innovations. But, to more thoughtful and reverent minds, it may appear that the minute and painful care which reveals itself in these thousands of alterations, is not, as has been so often and so coarsely said, a mere pedantic whim, but rather the fruit of a reverence for the smallest word of the living God, which is, unconsciously, wanting in many of the complainants.

Let us first call attention to a few renderings from which we feel compelled to dissent. The first is in the familiar passage, Rom. v. 3, 4: "tribulation worketh patience, and patience *probation*," δοκιμήν, A. V. "experience." In the first place, "experience" is rightly rejected, since it is not the meaning of δοκιμή. Secondly, δοκιμή does not mean the *process* of trial, but its *result*.* Thirdly, Paul does not here refer to the process, but to the result of trial. Thus Meyer on this passage notes *Bewährung* "verification," as distinguished

* *Vid.* Cremer's *Bib. Theo. Lex.*, where the passages are classified.

from *Prüfung* "examination," adding, "quae ostendit fidem non esse simulatam, sed veram, vivam, et ardentem." Similarly Bengel: "*δοκιμή* est *qualitas* ejus qui est *δόκιμος*." And again, Hodge (on Rom.): "It is *tried* integrity, a state of mind which has stood the test"; and so Alford, Shedd, and Beet. It is not *trial*, for that is already expressed by *ἐλπίς*. The question is then,—is "probation" the proper term for the *result* of trial? Here it must be said that the Revisers, if such is their meaning, could defend themselves on the ground of English classical usage. Thus, Jeremy Taylor, "When by miracle God dispensed great gifts to the laity, he gave *probation* that he intended that all should prophesy and preach." So Shakespeare, "Measure for Measure," v. i:

—"what he with his oath
And all probation will make up full clear."

Hamlet i. i :

"And of the truth herein
This present object (his father's ghost) made probation"
(Of the fact that spirits vanish at cockcrow).

Othello, iii. 3 :

"So prove it
That the probation bear no hinge nor loop
To hang a doubt on,"

But this has ceased to be the accepted meaning. Probation is almost universally understood of the process of trial; and that would be out of place here, for the connection of the words is this: first, tribulation, in the process of which patience is evolved; then, out of the patient endurance of tribulation comes forth the tried and proved character, the natural fruit of which is Christian hope. Experience does not always beget hope.* We think, therefore, that "proof" or "approval" is the true rendering. In other passages this sense is recognized and adopted. Thus 2 Cor. ii. 9, "that I might know the proof of you"; *i. e.*, whether ye prove yourselves true. In 2 Cor. ix. 13, "proving" is substituted for the A. V. "experiment," where "proof" would be better as we think: *i. e.*, through the evidence of your obedience furnished by this min-

* Conf. Beet on Romans, and Meyer: "Erprobtheit wird durch Ausdauer *gewirkt*; denn wer nicht ausdauert, wird dadurch zum *ἀδόκιμος*."

istration, we glorify God for your approved obedience. Phil. ii. 22, "ye know the proof of him" (Timothy); the evidence of his fidelity furnished by his service with Paul. The passage in Rom. is the only one in which "probation" is used; a case in which the meaning is clear, and where, if the Revisers have meant to use the word in the accepted sense, they have violated the logical connection; while, if they have meant it in the older sense, they have obscured the meaning.*

We greatly regret the retention at Acts xvii. 22, of the A. V. "superstitious," though "religious" is placed in the margin. The American Committee justly insist on "very religious" in the text, and we think concede too much by assenting to "somewhat superstitious" in the margin. "Superstitious" does injustice to Paul's habitual courtesy, no less than to his actual thought. He could not have taken a course better adapted to injure his none too promising case, than by opening upon the Athenians with a sweeping charge of superstition; and besides, the point of his remark is thus lost, which is, ye are indeed very religious, but your religious devotion obeys a vague craving, and lacks a definite object, which I will now reveal to you in the person of the God who made the world.

Heb. ix. 15, 17. Here we must dissent, as we seldom have found occasion to do, from the American Committee's exception to the change of "testament" to "covenant." The text of the Revisers as it stands is doubly complicated by the change to "covenant" in ver. 15, and the retention of "testament" in vv. 16, 17. The underlying idea of the section from ch. viii. to x. 18, is the analogy between the old covenant, in which brute victims were the symbols of mediation, and the new covenant in which Christ is the mediator. The key to both the analogy and the contrast is the fact that both covenants were inaugurated and ratified by sacrificial death accompanied with shedding of blood. Contrasting, therefore, the superior efficacy of Christ's blood and that of the animal sacrifices, he argues,—Christ is the mediator of a new covenant, in which the analogy of the old covenant is borne out in the matter of *death* and *blood*; that as death took place for the expiation

* Compare, by all means, James i. 12 and the Revised rendering.

of offences under the first covenant, they who have been called may receive (through Christ's superior sacrifice) the promise of eternal inheritance (as distinguished from the temporal inheritance of the old covenant). This is now illustrated in v. 16. Where there is a covenant, there must be the covenant-er's death; *i. e.*, in the person of the vicarious victim: for a covenant is *βεβαία*, "of force," or "ratified" *ἐπὶ νεκροῖς*, "upon the dead" (dead victims), for it never availeth while the covenanter liveth (*i. e.*, is not vicariously slain), and hence the first covenant was not inaugurated without blood. As then, under the law, the victim bore the death of the covenanter, so Christ bore death for those who made in Him a new covenant with God.*

Dr. Howard Crosby, in a recent article, sharply puts the *non sequitur* of the A. V. "Bulls and goats had to be slain as victims, and their blood spilled to establish the old covenant; and so Christ's blood had to be spilled to establish the new covenant: *because a man's testament is of no validity till he dies.*" All Dean Alford's labored disquisition on this passage fails to remove an incongruity which is disposed of simply, effectively, and consistently with both historic fact and logical sequence, by rendering *διαθήκη* as "covenant" throughout.

We have had occasion thus far frequently to call attention to the emendations of the American Committee as against certain readings adopted in the new text. These are friendly and honest differences among Christian scholars; and we must be allowed to say that the opinions of our countrymen on these disputed points, speak well for the breadth and accuracy of their scholarship. While there are a few points which perhaps we should hardly have thought important enough for a recorded dissent, we feel bound to say that the great majority of their decisions commend themselves as improvements. Such, for example, are "try" or "make trial" for "tempt," in passages like Matt. xvi. 1; xix. 3; Luke iv. 12; 1 Pet. i. 6; where no solicitation to evil is implied: the distinction between *διάβολος* "devil," and *δαίμων* or *δαϊμόνιον*, "demon": consistency in the use of "through" for *δια* when it relates to

* See an excellent paper by J. S. Parton, in *The Expositor*, 1st Series, Vol. VII., p. 77.

prophecy, and similar consistency in the use of "Holy Spirit." On the question of archaisms, they have, beyond doubt, the stronger case, though the English Revisers should have the benefit of all that answers to the hint of Archbishop Trench respecting the preservation of some of the archaic forms in the provincial dialects of England. "Who" or "that" for "which," when used of persons, and "are" for "be" in the present indicative, are changes which commend themselves on their very face. Simple necessity has compelled such a change as "we make known" for the nearly unintelligible phrase "we do you to wit," 2 Cor. viii. 1; but why retain in Phil. i. 22, "I wot not," to say nothing of the fact that "I wot, or know" is a more than doubtful rendering for *γνωρίζω*? Or why hold to "wist" in Mk. ix. 6; Luke ii. 49; Acts xii. 9; John v. 13? What *both* committees can have been thinking of when they left John the Baptist's head on a "charger," than which the language does not contain a more obsolete word, we cannot conceive.

Still, some valuable changes have been made here, quite as radical as any claimed by the American Committee. Such are "place of toll" for "receipt of custom," Matt. ix. 9; "wallet" for "scrip," Matt. x. 10; "be anxious" for "take thought," Matt. vi. 25; x. 19; Phil. iv. 6; "tablet" for "table," Luke i. 63; "baggage" for "carriages," Acts xxi. 15; "grandchildren" for "nephews," 1 Tim. v. 4; "strife" for "debate," Rom. i. 29; 2 Cor. xii. 20; "complaint" for "quarrel," Col. iii. 13; "villany" for "lewdness," Acts xviii. 14; "shame" for "dishonesty," 2 Cor. iv. 2; "stumble" for "offend," generally; "trade" for "occupy," Luke xix. 13; "objects of worship" for "devotions," Acts xvii. 23; "spake first" for "prevented," Matt. xvii. 25; "Passover" for "Easter," Acts xii. 4; "tender mercies," "affections," "heart," "compassion" for "bowels"; "earnestly" for "instantly," Luke vii. 4. We have already referred to the retention of "deceased," Matt. xxii. 25.

We can notice but cursorily the much-needed improvement in the consistent rendering of proper names, by which Mark, Luke, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Timothy, and especially Joshua (*vid.* Acts vii. 45; Heb. iv. 8); each appear under the same name in all parts of the New Testament. "Calvary" has become so dear a word in Christian thought that we shrink a little

from its more literal rendering, even though it is thus brought into harmony with the parallel passages. We are prompted to ask why *χλιδάρχοις*, which everywhere else is translated "chief captains," is rendered in Mark vi. 21, alone, "high captains"; and we are glad that the American Committee have insisted on changing *ἀσδάριον* "farthing," which is also the rendering of *κοδράντης*, to "penny," and *δηνάριον* "penny" to "shilling."

In the removal of the false distinctions made in the A. V. under the influence of the former Revisers' anxiety to avoid "tying themselves to uniformity of phrasing and to an identity of words"; in the adjustment of the proportionate force of words, as in reducing the various degrees of affection expressed by the various renderings of *αγαπητός* to one standard expression, "beloved"; in giving uniform renderings to *ὑποτάσσειν* and *θρόνος*; in correctly translating *σπαρείς* in Matt. xiii. 20, so as to make it consist with Mark iv. 16;—no less for the restoration of real distinctions, as between *εἶναι* and *γίνεσθαι*; *παῖς* and *υἱός*; *παιδία* and *νήπιοι*; *ἄλλος* and *ἕτερος*; *θηρίον* and *ζῶον*; *ἀπιστεῖν* and *ἀπειθεῖν*; *σχῆμα* and *μορφή*; *ναός* and *ἱερόν*; *ᾄδης* and *γέεννα*; *αὐλή* and *ποίμνη*,—the Revisers are entitled to our hearty thanks. These are not trifling matters. They involve facts, doctrines, important shades of thought; and every touch of this kind sharpens the lines of divine truth, brightens its graphic pictures, and lets us more deeply into its heavenly thought.

Passing from these minor details to the matter of translation in general, we are embarrassed by the mass of material presented for our selection. No one, we think, can read the first six chapters of the Gospel of John in the new version, without a feeling of delight at the vividness and freshness with which the words come to him. In the Epistles, where the changes are more numerous, there is a sense as of a purer atmosphere and of clearer vision. Take, for example, the second to the Corinthians, with its marks of haste; its intense feeling; its rapid interchange of affection and indignation, irony and pathos;—that "labyrinth of conflicting emotions," as Dean Stanley calls it, with its obscure connections and difficult constructions. It is a subject for close and patient study in the original, a hard piece of Greek; but in the A. V., we make bold to say that there are portions of it from which the average

English reader finds it well-nigh impossible to extract any consistent sense. Neither in this nor in any part of the Revision will the translators' work render the commentary superfluous; the most exacting could not expect the Revisers to make an easy and flowing, and at the same time accurate, translation of such Greek; but, for all that, we read this valuable Epistle in its new form at once with relief and delight. We may note a few points of this improvement as well as a few which are open to criticism.

Ch. i. 9. Here there is a question concerning the true rendering of ἀποκριμα. Grimm (Clavis Nov. Test.) says "*responsum*," and quotes Josephus of a response of the Roman Senate. The use of ἀποκρίνω in Biblical Greek favors this; and "sentence," if a legitimate rendering at all, is a roundabout one, derived from the classical use of the word—"to deprive of by a judicial sentence." The Revisers put "sentence" in the margin, and adopt "answer," which is thus aptly expounded by Stanley: "When I have asked myself what would be the issue of this struggle, the answer has been, 'death.'" While the A. V. "sentence" has the advantage of being more readily understood, the other rendering accords with the style of thought in the Epistle, in which the key-note of a sentiment sometimes is hidden in the figure underlying a word; and we prefer the revised rendering, therefore, to the old, for which the American Committee stand.

In ver. 11, the words "by many persons" are put into their proper place with "thanks may be given." ver. 15: The American Committee rightly prefer "first" to "before"; the sense being not "sooner than I did come," but "before I went into Macedonia."

Ch. ii. 5, in the A. V., is obscure. It is cleared by the revised rendering. "If any hath caused sorrow, he hath caused sorrow not to me, but in part (that I press not too heavily) to you all."

Ver. 16. "A savor from death unto death." The change to "from" (A. V. "of") is effective in bringing out the figure, which is that of the apostle's own life as offered in sacrifice to God, diffusing the knowledge of God as a sweet odor from a sacrifice; but the sacrifice is a *living* one; and the odor proceeds *from* life and makes *for* life or is unto life for those who are saved; while the very fragrance of that life may have, to

those who reject Christ, the effect of a deadly odor. The latter thought is thus the same as that of Peter (1st Ep. ii. 7, 8), expressed under a different figure, according to which Christ is at the same time "the head of the corner" and a "stone of stumbling."

Ch. iii. 6. Paul does not say, as A. V., "has made us able ministers," which, according to our modern sense, especially, is a thoroughly unpauline thought,—but *ἐκένωσεν*, "made us sufficient as ministers," gave us the strength and necessary means for our work. This rendering also brings the words into harmony with v. 5.

Ver. 7. Two errors are corrected. *ἐγενήθη* is not "was," but "came to pass"; and *ἐν δόξῃ* is not "glorious," but "with or in glory." Hence the renderings "came with glory," "was passing away" or "was being done away," state the fact which Paul meant to convey, while the A. V. "was to be done away," gives a wrong sense besides being ungrammatical. Paul's meaning was this: Moses, when he found the glory vanishing from his face, covered it with a veil to hide, not its effulgence, but its waning; so that the children of Israel should not look on the end (*i. e.*, the destruction) of that which was passing away, *καταργουμένου*. (Conf. v. 13).

Let us turn to the Epistle to the Galatians. Ch. i. 6. We have the distinction restored between *ἕτερον* and *ἄλλο*—"a different" and "another." The gospel of the false teachers is a *different* gospel, not *another*, since there can be but one gospel; and as theirs is *different* it is no gospel at all.

Ver. 23. Paul could not have truthfully said that he "destroyed" the faith, but he did "make havoc" of it.

Ch. ii. 2. "I laid before them," *ἀναθέμην*, expresses better than "communicated" the idea of *consultation* which was in Paul's mind: I laid before them with a view to consult. "Should be running" is better than "should run," since it sharpens the distinction between his past ministry and his ministry now in progress. I consulted the men of repute lest "I should be running" (the work now in progress) or "had run" (my past endeavors) in vain.

Ver. 11. *κατεγνωσμένος ἦν*, "stood condemned" is much more true to the fact than the A. V. "was to be blamed"; which, in view of the actual state of the case as here narrated, is very

tame. Paul is here showing the pressing cause of his accusation of Peter, who was actually, by his own behavior, not merely blameable, but open to the *judgment* of his Christian brethren.

Ch. iv. 14. "My temptation which was in my flesh," A. V., is Paul's infirmity considered as a trial to himself; which was not his meaning, for he was speaking of his infirmity as a temptation to the Galatians to reject him. Hence the Revision correctly reads, "that which was a temptation to you in my flesh."

Ver. 17. To nine out of ten uneducated English readers, "they zealously affect you, but not well" would be an enigma. "Affect" in the sense of "pay court" has become practically obsolete. The new rendering is, therefore, an improvement: "they zealously seek you in no good way." With this goes the change in the next verse, "it is good to be zealously sought in a good matter," which, at the same time, makes the words intelligible, and corrects a popular misconception which has attached to "zealously affected." Farther, the emphasis is correctly laid on πάντοτε. Whoever, at *any time*, will pay court to you for a good purpose, let him do it.

Ch. v. 1. Here is a somewhat startling but excellent correction. In the first place, because it follows the Greek in expressing two distinct thoughts which the A. V. combines in one sentence. There is first a taking up the thought of iv. 31. "For *freedom* (adopt the Am. Com.'s rendering) did Christ set us free"; second, the consequent exhortation: "stand fast therefore." In the second place, because, in following the Greek order, it retains the twofold emphasis on "freedom" and "stand fast," while the A. V. emphasizes only the latter.

A few specimens from the Epistle of James, which is one of the best pieces of work in the book.

Ch. i. 7. We have "surge" for "wave," a closer rendering of κλύδωνι the *dashing* billow, conf. κλύζω to wash or dash over.

Ver. 8. The last clause of the verse is connected and placed in apposition with "he that doubteth," instead of being made an independent clause stating a general aphorism.

Ver. 15. The stages of the growth of evil desire are defined by distinguishing between τίκτει "beareth," and ἀποκύει, "bring-

eth forth." Lust conceives and *bears* sin, and sin when *full-grown*, ἀποτελεσθεῖσα, *bringeth forth* death. The metaphor, which is marred by the rendering "finished," is thus restored throughout.

Ver. 17. "Shadow that is cast by turning" is indeed less concise, but is more intelligible than "shadow of turning." The figure is that of a heavenly body, which, in its revolution, presents its shadowed side to us.

Ver. 21. "Overflowing of wickedness" is a great improvement on "superfluity of naughtiness," which is to the last degree pedantic, artificial, and obscure.

Ver. 25. The delicate definitive force of the article τὸν is to be observed: "the perfect law, the law of liberty." The antithesis is also much sharpened by the correction of the vicious hendiadys—"a forgetful hearer." The literal rendering "hearer of forgetfulness" would be obscure, besides being unidiomatic, and the awkwardness has been ingeniously avoided by the rendering, "a hearer that forgetteth, a doer that worketh."

Ver. 26. "Thinketh himself" for "seem," is both better grammar and better sense. A man can scarcely *seem* to be religious "when," as Trench observes, "his religious pretensions are belied and refuted by the allowance of an unbridled tongue." "Seem" would have been expressed by φαίνεται, whereas the verb here is δοκεῖ, expressing the *opinion*, (δόξα) which one forms. A similar correction may be noted at Gal. ii. 6, 9, where "seemed," δοκούντων, δοκῶντες, is changed to "were reputed."

Ch. ii. 21. The force of the aorist participle ἀνενέγκας, is not *temporal*, "when he had offered," but *explanatory*, "in that he offered."

Ch. iii. 5. The new rendering spoils a popular proverb, but corrects an error, though the Greek cannot be literally rendered without awkwardness. The philosophical sense of ὕλην "matter," is replaced by the primary meaning "wood" or "forest," and we thus have a distinct picture instead of the rather vague image (if it be an image at all), of a fire kindling a "matter."

Ver. 11. The literal rendering of ὀπῆς, "opening" of the fountain for "place," brings the word into harmony with the figure.

Ch. v. 3. The etymological relationship between *καίωται* and *ῥῶς* is preserved by changing "cankered" to "rusted."

Similarly the exquisite little letter to Philemon comes out of the Revisers' hands with new freshness and beauty.

Ver. 13. "In thy behalf" is a happy change for "in thy stead," expressing as it does the delicate suggestion of Paul that Philemon would have been glad to do these things for him.

Ver. 15. "Departed" of the A.V. does not, like "was parted," give us Paul's thought that God had a purpose in separating Onesimus from Philemon for a season.

Ver. 16. "More than a servant" conveys the idea of *quality*, which was Paul's thought, while "above a servant" carries chiefly the idea of higher *place*.

Few changes have called out more protest than that of "charity" to "love" in 1 Cor. xiii.; and yet few are more valuable or more easily justified. Let us say here what seems to be so often forgotten, that translators have no right to retain imperfect or erroneous renderings on the ground that the pulpit or the commentary will set them right in the popular mind. They are to translate as if there were neither pulpit nor commentary, as in many cases there is not, with the single purpose of making the Word speak its own message as clearly as possible to the reader of every condition and of every grade of culture. Hence it is no argument for the retention of an inferior word that the reader's mind, instructed by preaching or otherwise, will apply a corrective. It is urged in favor of retaining "charity," that everybody understands what it means; an assertion which we venture to deny. "Charity" has acquired two peculiar meanings, both which are indeed included or implied in "love," but neither of which expresses more than a single phase of love: namely, *tolerance* and *beneficence*. In "love," on the other hand, we have a word the meaning of which is universally understood, and which is in no danger of being perverted. The rendering "charity" following the "*caritas*" of the Latin, is merely another of the many specimens of that vicious variety which was one of the cardinal principles of the Revisers of 1611. In the great majority of cases they themselves translate *ἀγάπη* by "love": always in the Gospels, and mostly elsewhere, except in 1 Cor., where "love" occurs but twice. And there is abso-

lutely no more reason for saying "charity suffereth long," than for saying "the *charity* of God is shed abroad in our hearts": "God commendeth his *charity* toward us": "Who shall separate us from the *charity* of Christ?" "The *charity* of Christ constraineth us." "God is *charity*." The real objection after all, is, at bottom, the destruction of the familiar rhythm: and we are glad that the Revisers have made a clean sweep throughout the New Testament, and have rendered *ἀγάπη* everywhere by "love."

We breathe more freely at the removal from 1 Cor. xi. 29 of that horrible stumbling-block which has ruined the peace of so many believers, and has kept so many of Christ's little ones from His table—"He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh *damnation* to himself." The "unworthily," which is an interpolation from v. 27, is properly expunged; and the text now reads, "He that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, if he discern not the Lord's body"; the rendering of the last clause defining more sharply the special cause of judgment and the essential element of unworthy participation in the holy sacrament.

At Phil. ii. 6, "thought it not robbery to be equal with God" is changed to "counted it not a prize (*ἀρπαγμόν*, a thing to be grasped or snatched) to be on an equality with God." The A. V. makes a logical *non sequitur*: "thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but—" we expect as the proper antithesis, "*claimed* equality with God"; whereas we have "but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant," etc. Secondly, the A. V. adds an unnecessary element if its rendering is correct. Being in the *μορφῇ* of God, being "the outraying of His glory and the express image of His person," we should hardly need to be told that He did not think it robbery to be equal with God. That would be self-evident. The other rendering makes the whole consistent. Although in the form of God, Christ did not make the assertion of His equality with God (thus implied) the special point in His incarnation, but rather asserted therein His *humanity*, His fellowship with our race. Hence, He thought not equality with God a thing to be grasped at, but, on the contrary, accepted the conditions of our humanity even unto death.

At Rev. viii. 13, we find for "an angel" (*ἄγγελον*) an

"eagle" (ἀετοῦ). He flies, crying, "Woe for them that dwell on the earth." He is "the symbol of judgment and vengeance rushing to its prey." Conf. Deut. xxviii. 49; Hos. viii. 1; Hab. i. 8; Job ix. 26; Jer. iv. 13; xlix. 22.

At Matt. vii. 29, the introduction of the reading, αὐτῶν, "*their* scribes," bears indirectly on the question of the authenticity of John's gospel; against which it is urged that the Jews are treated in it as entirely foreign to the writer; but this passage might justly be cited to show that precisely the same objection lies against Matthew's gospel.

At Mark vi. 20, another change of reading gives point to a singularly meaningless statement in the A. V., where we read that Herod heard John gladly, and "did many things." With the reading ἡπόρει for ἐποίη, we have "was much perplexed," which was certainly very likely to be the case under all the circumstances.

Phil. iii. 21, "Who shall fashion anew the body," etc. Here is one of the many cases in which the English reader will naturally ask, "What need of an alteration? Why does not 'change' convey the sense equally well?" For all practical purposes, perhaps, it does; yet it is also one of those cases where a distinction quite concealed in the A. V. is marked. The two words for "change," μετασχηματίζω and μεταμορφόμαι, perpetuate the distinction between σχῆμα, the outward, temporary, mutable "*fashion*"; and μορφή, the "*form*" (for want of a better word) identified with the specific character. Hence in Rom. viii. 29, we have σύμμορφους, "*con-formed* to the image of his Son," changed into the same μορφή, into the likeness of his perfect nature; and, similarly, in 2 Cor. iii. 18, "*transformed* into the same image"; while in Rom. xii. 2, we have μὴ συνσχηματίζεσθε, "be not *fashioned* according to this world," this visible, changeful world, but μεταμορφοῦσθε, "be ye *transformed*" in character, nature, inner being, "by the renewing of your *mind*."

At Luke iv. 12, the change involves the correction of a historical error. Luke wrote that Jesus was forty days *in the wilderness*, but not *tempted* forty days. The A. V. says he was forty days tempted of the devil.

The rendering of τὰ ἐνόντα at Luke xi. 41, is brought into harmony with the context by changing "such things as ye

have" to "those things which are within." Christ has been speaking of true, *inward* righteousness, as contrasted with outward formality, under the figure of a cup—clean without, but filthy within. Hence He says, "Let your alms be the outcome of a pure heart; as something from a cup clean within, and not merely for outward show."

Luke xxi. 19. Again a proverb is spoiled and a blunder corrected. *κτήσσεσθε* does not mean "possess"—a meaning which is confined to the perfect *κέκτημαι*, but rather "win," "acquire." Hence, the sense is correctly given by the revised rendering. Ye shall be delivered up, hated, slain; but "in your patience ye shall win your souls," or save your immortal lives.

Acts ii. 6. Another misstatement is corrected. The Greek is *γενομένης τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης*; literally, "this sound or voice having taken place or come to pass." The A. V. refers this to the popular report of the scenes at the Pentecostal gathering; hence "now when this was noised abroad"; whereas the *φωνῆς* refers to the sound of the "rushing, mighty wind."* Hence the Revisers render, "and when this sound was heard."

We have given but a few specimens out of hundreds. To present even a small part of the whole body of changes, is, of course, out of the question. Scores of others, equally interesting and important with those we have cited, many of them involving difficult exegetical questions, without the careful discussion of which they could not be understood or justified—such passages as Rom. v. 1; Acts xiii. 18, 20; 1 John iii. 19, 20; 2 Cor. iii. 18; Heb. iv. 2; Col. ii. 15, 23; Phil. i. 22—we must leave untouched. But those we have cited, and which are fair specimens of the whole, will be sufficient, we believe, to show that the changes are not trifling; that they are not the outcome of mere scholarly whims, but have been made for substantial reasons, and in the interest of truth and perspicuity; that they make for the integrity of that Word of which we cannot afford to have the smallest part impaired by carelessness or ignorance.†

* Though some refer it to the sound of the speaking with tongues.

† Even these will prove the utter baselessness of such sweeping assertions as that "the uprooting of the old book, itself a dismal price," buys "for us trivial changes like 'footstool of his feet' for 'His footstool.'" The man who gives the public such a passage as *representative* of the Revisers' work, shows himself to be either ignorant, careless, or uncandid.

It will be evident that we have not treated the Revision with indiscriminate eulogy. The work is not without blemish, and no men would be more ready to admit the fact than the Revisers themselves; and it would seem to us the part of wisdom not to regard this result as final, but, when the Old Testament Committee shall have finished their task, or earlier, to reassemble the New Testament Committee, and carefully to review the work in the light of the body of matured and discriminating criticism which will have accumulated by that time.

What then have we in the Revised version? Not an English classic, surely. That is an impossibility. We cannot have a translation or even a revision of the work of 1611 in the light of the scholarship of 1880, and have the classic English Bible as the result. For the classic we must go back to the King James Bible, which is ours still to keep and to read. But is it a classic that we want first of all? Is it not time that we should draw the line between the Bible as a classic and the Bible as a trustworthy manual for the humblest English reader? Certain it is that we could not have the two combined even in a version which should be as superior to the present Revision as King James' revision was to the translation of Wyclif. If the choice is inevitable between the classic and the clearer and more truthful version of God's Word, we can afford to let the classic go. Daily bread is neither classic nor heroic, but it is something better; and the world's salvation largely depends upon the Bible being made as familiar as the poor man's loaf.

Not a classic then. Not the unimpaired flavor of the familiar version, so dear and so justly dear. A new element asserts itself throughout; the savor of a modern time breathes through the book; the impress of a riper, broader, richer, more accurate scholarship is upon it, and its lines are sharpened and their mellowed blendings often dissipated, rudely it may sometimes seem, by the firm touch of an incisive criticism. We have the New Testament in plain, if not in classic English; an immeasurable *practical* gain, if not an *artistic* gain. That may be justly said of the English New Testament, which a recent writer so well says on the revision of the Book of Common Prayer:

"Many worse things might happen than that the nineteenth century should leave its impress upon the pages. In fact, it is just as possible, if men will only think so, to use our language with effect for any good purpose to-day as it was three hundred years ago. All that is necessary is a willingness to submit to the same restrictions, and those mostly moral, that controlled the old writers; and our work, though not identical with theirs, will have the proper similarity. True, a modern author may not be able to reproduce, without a palpable betrayal of affectation and mannerism, the precise characteristics of a by-gone style. Chattertons are not numerous. It is easier to secure for the brass andirons and mahogany dining-chairs of our own manufacture the look of those that belonged to our grandfathers, than it is to catch the tones of voices long dead; and just as good judgment dictates the wisdom of repeating the honest and thorough workmanship of the old cabinet-makers in place of slavishly imitating their patterns, so it will be well if the compilers of devotional forms for modern use seek to say what they have to say with sixteenth century simplicity, rather than in sixteenth century speech."—REV. WILLIAM REED HUNTINGTON, of Worcester, Mass., in the *Church Review*.

We have a translation based on a vastly improved text, purged of hundreds of errors, great and small, cleared of scores of obscurities and ambiguities, and bringing to light elements of beauty, force, and suggestiveness which have hitherto been hidden from all but scholars. Such results as these, we submit, may be fairly set off against occasional little pedantries, and some renderings, which we may conceive to be less felicitous or less correct, of passages over which the highest authorities are at variance.

The old structure abides in its integrity. Its foundations are unshaken. Deep in the eternal counsels of God they lie bedded, and all the fresh and inquisitive wisdom of all generations to come shall not move them. But the stones of the superstructure have been fretted into lacework here and there, until the lines of the carvings, once so sharp, have ceased to tell their story to the asking eye of the child. Here and there an old word, like a quaint gargoyle of which the conduit has become choked by the accumulations of centuries, has ceased to convey the living water, and is only a curiosity. The old pavement, trodden by countless feet into heaving waves of precious mosaic, has indeed a fascination in its rich irregularity; yet shall it, for the sake of this, be left to trip the foot of the worshipper as he walks with his eye on the cross? Better surely that the antiquarian be disappointed than that the child or the peasant stumble on the way to the altar. If the "dim religious light" filter through cobwebs, shall the hand be stayed which sets itself to cleanse the panes on which art and devotion poured the rich dyes in shapes of martyr and apostle? If

a symbol, which once told a great truth plainly to the men whose dust lines the dark crypts, has become as lifeless as they, shall he be held guilty of sacrilege or of ruthless iconoclasm, who re-embodies the old meaning in a form which speaks as plainly as of old to the *living* worshipper?

In the name of Christ, then, we give our little tribute of thanks to these noble Christian scholars for this fruit of their labor. We honor their patience, their fidelity, their scholarly acuteness, their reverence in dealing with the Word. Whether their work shall receive the endorsement of general adoption or not, it is a grand contribution toward a perfected English Bible. Whatever future efforts shall be made in the direction of revision, those who shall inaugurate them will find themselves under ever-growing obligations to these men, who have massed the accumulated treasures of New Testament exegesis and textual criticism, and the ripened classical learning of the world's most prolific centuries of scholarship, upon the Version of 1881.

MARVIN R. VINCENT.

II.

THE PROOF OF NEW TESTAMENT MIRACLE COMPARED WITH THE PROOF OF THE MIRACLE OF THE ROMAN CALENDAR.

IN the modern assaults upon the Gospel, *miracle* is attacked with especial energy, but with no unity in the method of assault. The old ground developed by Hume is strongly occupied by one class of sceptical thinkers; the order of nature, the scientific law of continuity, is so fixed and inviolable that miracles are impossible. Others, avoiding any dogmatic assertion as to the abstract possibility of miraculous events, hold that such is the essential limitations of human knowledge, that such an event must, even if actual, ever elude discrimination, and be incapable of proof. Others again simply maintain that the miracles recorded in the Christian Scriptures are, as a matter of fact, not proven, alleging that the miracles of St. Ignatius and St. Francis of Assisi stand upon equal evidence.

So clear is the demonstration of the possibility of miracle on the datum of a personal God and so resistless the evidence that if *possible*, it is *provable*, that many of the later sceptics have openly receded from Hume's ground, and taken up a new position. They concede the possibility and provability of miracle, and now simply assert that the miracle of the Gospels is not proved. The possibility of miracle is admitted as a bare possibility; but they deny that it has ever passed into fact. They admit it can be proved if it should happen, and deny that it is proved to have actually occurred. Renan says in so many words: "We do not say a miracle is impossible, we say only no miracle has ever yet been proved." Froude takes the ground that the evidence of New Testament miracle is of no higher value than the evidence of the miracle of the

Roman saints. He says: "On human evidence the miracles of St. Teresa and St. Francis of Assisi are as well established as those of the New Testament." This makes up the issue; let us see if this assertion is true.

The question now is, whether the miracle of the Gospels is or is not proved in point of fact; and whether it is or is not proved by a species of evidence which draws a broad line of distinction between itself and the evidence of the alleged miracle of the Roman saints. The case is thus stated by Froude:

"The lives of the saints of the Catholic Church from the time of the apostles until the present day, are a complete tissue of miracles resembling and rivalling those of the Gospels. Some of these stories are romantic and imaginative; some clear, literal, and prosaic; some rest on mere tradition; some on the sworn testimony of eye-witnesses; some are obvious fables; some are as well-authenticated as facts of such a kind can be authenticated at all. The Protestant Christian rejects every one of them—rejects them without inquiry—involves those for which there is good authority and those for which there is none or little, in one absolute, contemptuous, and sweeping denial. The Protestant Christian feels it more likely in the words of Hume, that men should deceive or be deceived, than that the laws of nature should be violated. At this moment we are beset with reports of conversations with spirits, of tables miraculously lifted, of hands projected out of the world of shadows into this mortal life. An unusually able, accomplished person accustomed to deal with common-sense facts, a celebrated political economist and notorious for business-like habits, assured this writer that a certain Mesmerist, who was my informant's intimate friend, had raised a dead girl to life. We should believe the people who tell us these things in any ordinary matter; they would be admitted in a court of justice as good witnesses in a criminal case, and a jury would hang a man on their word. The person just now alluded to is incapable of telling a wilful lie, yet our experience of the regularity of nature on one side is so uniform, and our experience of the capacities of human folly on the other, is so large, that when people tell us these wonderful stories, most of us are contented to smile; we do not care so much as to turn out of our way to examine them."

Upon this statement we have only to remark, that so far as Protestant Christians, who have a proper appreciation of the grounds of the Christian faith, are concerned, they are not at all solicitous to deny any fact well authenticated upon any subject, whether of the miracles of saints or phenomena of Mesmerism, or facts of spiritualism or wonders of Hindoo jugglery. A fact is an independent occurrence, and cannot possibly be damaged by any other fact; the admission of the alleged facts in the field of calendar miracle or Mesmerism, if we choose to admit them really or hypothetically, cannot possibly discredit the facts of the Gospel history. All we should require is proof of the fact, to secure the full admission of it. Whether we should agree to the inference from the fact, and to the alleged miraculous origin of the event, is another question: that would

depend upon the nature of the fact, which *if true miracle* will always authenticate itself. Nor shall we at all impeach the general credibility of the witnesses of legendary miracle or even their special credibility if deserved, in reference to the facts alleged. The facts when proved may be fully admitted without admitting any special theory of their origin or significance, or at all shaking the supreme authority of the miracle of the Gospel. We are fully prepared to admit all such facts in the alleged miracles of the saints as may be fairly proved. If there were no such wonders developed in the history of the Church, *prophecy* would be falsified. The apostle Paul distinctly foretold that a power designated as "the man of sin" should be revealed, "sitting in the temple of God," whose "coming should be after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders." To admit the alleged facts of saintly miracle, so called, when truly proved, is not only just and honest, but is needful to vindicate prophecy. The admission of the facts does by no means carry the admission of their imputed origin, nor compel the admission of any claim or asserted doctrine which is supposed to be sustained by the facts. We are ready to accept any given fact which may be proved by sufficient evidence; we will admit it as a mere occurrence, but the fact must authenticate its origin before we shall accept any special theory of its origin as miraculous. Nor will we admit any inferences from the fact except such as are legitimately drawn from it. This procedure is not the mere caprice of Protestant prejudice as is so pointedly insinuated, but the fair dictate of honesty and good sense. It is a mistake of Mr. Froude to suppose the Protestant Christian finds it necessary to discredit all the alleged wonders of the mediæval saints. It is a just procedure to apply the order of nature to arrest the credit of such allegations, until sufficient evidence is furnished to sustain the allegation. When that evidence is furnished, we are fully entitled to examine and test the fact by every legitimate application of a suitable touchstone. The principles upon which Protestant Christians justify their firm adherence to the miracle of the Gospels, and yet impeach the miracle of saints and pagans even when the evidence may fairly establish a fact with an appearance of a miraculous character, will be explained and vindicated as we proceed. The

soundness of those principles is capable of a triumphant vindication.

A single preliminary difficulty must be removed before we enter upon the direct comparison between the proofs of the miracle of the Gospel and the miracle of the Calendar. It is asserted by some sceptics that time weakens the force of evidence, and that the evidence of Gospel miracle has been so far obscured by time, it cannot now command a rational assent. What then are the conditions upon which a reliable statement of events can be safely transmitted through long periods of time? This is the first point to be settled. If the facts can be safely transmitted, it is a manifest confusion of thought to impeach the evidence solely on the ground of time. A thing true, an actual occurrence, is *forever true*. The proof of its truth at the time of its occurrence is forever reliable proof. The only thing to be done in order to secure rational credit to an indefinite future, is to provide a reliable method of transmitting the evidence. If that evidence did once really prove the fact, it will prove it forever, and it is absurd to talk of the lapse of time discrediting evidence. If the evidence can be reliably transmitted, it will remain good proof forever. What, then, are the conditions of such a transmission, particularly in ages before the improved method and guarantee of printing was available for the purpose? How could we, for example, without the aid of the press, transmit for twenty centuries to come, a reliable account of any given facts of our contemporary history?

1. Obviously the first thing to be done would be to secure a written record of the facts, by persons thoroughly acquainted with them. Such a record will be indispensable: *first*, as a permanent repertory of the facts in a form which is capable of indefinite reduplication as necessity may demand; and *second*, in order to give full force and effect to another set of guarantees to be mentioned hereafter, and to prevent their being robbed of their testimonial power by the lapse of time and events.

2. A second expedient would be the formation of an *organization of men*, permanent in its existence, capable of an endless succession from generation to generation, like a civil, State, or Masonic order—with an order of officers to take

charge of the facts and the record of them, and by perpetual proclamation and public teaching from day to day and week to week—keep the facts constantly before the public from generation to generation. Such an institution existing or founded at the time when the facts occurred—charged with the single business of keeping them alive before the public—with the written record to prevent misapprehension and misstatement of the facts by the later successors in the office of the teacher—will afford a clear proof of the possibility of a reliable transmission of facts and evidence through long periods of time. Such an endless order of living men can give the needed guarantee against the evasive power of time and events, so long as it remains uncorrupt in its testimony to the facts.

3. A third expedient is to establish monumental memorials of the miraculous events, at least of one or more of the most remarkable of the series. This is a striking mode of transmitting evidence. These memorials may be of two kinds, stationary or movable. A granite shaft or a bronze statue erected in memory of a great man or a great event, is a testimony to the historical fact it commemorates, as long as the monument shall stand. A contemporary record explanatory of the purpose for which it was erected will not only be an additional testimony to that of the monument, but *may* be of great value in preserving the full testimonial significance of it. The pyramids of Egypt, at this distant point from their erection, disclose only a part of their significance as the tomb of the Pharaohs; it is obvious how valuable a contemporary record, fully explanatory, would be in enhancing their power as testimony to the views they were designed to embody. Movable monuments are either commemorative acts, or significant meanings attached to days and months and years, and are equally, if not more powerful as memorial monuments, less destructible than stationary memorials, and not confined to any locality. Of this sort is the month of July, which is a memorial of Julius Cæsar. The first day of the week is a memorial of the resurrection of Jesus; the bread and wine of the supper constitute a memorial of His death, and the living organization of the Church is a grand memorial of the influence and doctrines of the Nazarene in the same way in which the Mormon Church is a memorial of the influence and doc-

trines of Joe Smith. Anything to which a significance can be attached by statute laws, by custom, or agreement, can be made an instrument of transmitting ideas, and as long as it lasts, it will convey the meaning of which it has been constituted the vehicle. The influence of a contemporary record in preserving the testimonial force of such a monument is obvious in producing that result and in illustrating the value of such a record.

4. Another powerful agency in transmitting the evidence of facts, is the interweaving of the facts themselves, or of the doctrines and institutions based upon those facts with the public civil history or the governmental acts of nationalities existing at or shortly after the occurrence of the facts; first *historically* as a part of the national annals; and *second* into their legislation. The legislation of the United States Congress and the history of the last forty years of the American people will forever be a testimony to the existence and peculiarities of the Mormon sect. The testimony to the facts is thus widened from the basis of personal and propagandist testimony to that of an incidental, public, and wholly independent testimony. Many who find themselves incapable of an effective impression from the testimony of the apostles, the official witnesses, are impressed by the history and legislation both of the Jewish people and of the Roman Empire in relation to Christianity. Facts and evidence thus transmitted, put upon record, committed to an endless organization of men for the purpose of a perpetual daily and weekly proclamation of the facts from generation to generation, certified by memorial monuments, and at once and increasingly interwoven with the public history and legislation of nations—facts so certified can be reliably transmitted through any conceivable duration; and the sceptical pretext that time has or can weaken the Christian evidences is without foundation.

We are now ready to enter on the question of the actual proof of the miracle of the Gospels, and to point out the powerful line of distinction between it and the evidence of the miracle of the Calendar—a distinction as great on the proof as that between the actions themselves.

1. The first grand mark of genuine miracle *is its relation to revelation*. The fact which draws the first grand line of

distinction between the miracle of the Gospel and the lying wonders of the man of sin, which Froude pronounces equally credible and equally proved, is the admitted fact that *the canon of revelation is closed*. The miracle of the Gospel is inseparably connected with a revelation from God; the miracle of the Calendar is invariably separated from revelation. All efforts to discount this principle fail. There is an inseparable connection between all true miracle after creation and a revelation from God—a *correlation* which constitutes an invincible line of reasoning from one branch of the correlation to the other. The testimony of the Scriptures which is authoritative, as between Protestants and Romanists, clearly settles that the use and purpose of miracle, as we have already seen, is to make God a witness to truth which He has ordered to be communicated to man. The *necessity* of such a testimony from God in any case of alleged commission to speak in His name, is affirmed by common sense, which is authoritative, as between Christians and infidels. The mysterious conditions of human life have always created a demand for information touching the nature of these fearful dispensations and their bearing on the future. Impostors have found in this condition of human feeling a wide field for their arts of religious deception. The whole value of their teaching is conditioned upon its being a revelation from God; no testimony from any other source is considered anything worth because men know their destinies are to be controlled by the Supreme Power, and therefore they are only concerned to know from Him the terms and conditions by which His decisions will be regulated. All is dependent upon His will, which no one can know until He reveals it in some way of action or words. Independent of such an announcement, no one is competent to declare it. Whenever, therefore, an agent comes with a claim that he is sent by God to make known His will, and declare terms on which the divine favor will be shown, *God must certify him*. Until he is so certified, men have no right to receive him as a divine commissioner. His credentials must be authenticated; his claim must be proved, or it is absolutely inadmissible; and as he claims to come from God, no other witness but God himself is possibly allowable. God must put a seal upon his character as His official representative, or no

man can rely on what he says as really the mind of God. Hence the inseparable correlation between revelation and miracle as testimony. Wherever subsequent to creation revelation is found, miracle is found; they stand in a fixed logical relation to each other. Nor is the sceptical sneer, that the Christian argument is a gross example of reasoning in a circle—proving the revelation by the miracle and the miracle by the revelation, at all justified by the fact. The Christian theory proves revelation by miracle, and miracle by its own appropriate, but independent evidence. The correlation between miracle and revelation, which clearly emerges when the reality of miracle is proved, is seen to be a true correlation, like that between husband and wife, or father and son. The one notion is then seen to carry the other, because they are inseparable in fact. Whenever God would reveal His will, miracle is seen; where miracle is seen, there is a revelation of his will; and when revelation ceases, miracle ceases. Here is the first fatal objection to those miracles of the Roman Calendar of saints, which Froude pronounces to stand on as good a basis as the miracles of the Scriptures. *The canon is closed*; revelation from God has ceased; and miracle ceased with it. We may admit all the allegations of the Roman Calendar as facts; but they cannot be true miracle—*the finger of God*. They *may* be the result of the interposition of other beings; we may admit even this as an entirely gratuitous conception; they are certainly not the result of *divine power*. Hypothetically admitting the facts as they are claimed by the Romanist, they stand discredited as true miracle by the irresistible warrant of the scriptural and inseparable correlation between miracle and revelation. What revelation from God, additional to the closed canon of the sacred books, did St. Ignatius or St. Francis bring to the world? If they brought one, where is it to be found? If they did not bring one, their alleged miracles are discredited; they are not true signatures of God, whatever else they may be.

This mark of distinction between true and false miracle also serves to repel the insinuation of Froude that the Protestant rejection of Papal miracle is the result of an unreasoning prejudice, which is not justified in any one standing, as the Protestant does, on Christian ground and admitting the reality

of miraculous intervention. The distinction just discussed vindicates the exercise of that sound common sense which Protestants have always applied to legendary miracle, at once applying the uniformity of nature to all such allegations in advance of testimony, and rejecting them as *divine miracle* without hesitation, while standing ready at the same time to accept all of fact in the allegations made which are proved to be true. They are ready to accept the facts when proved, without determining what they may positively be; but they reject the miraculous character of the facts in advance of all inquiry because the close of revelation and the consequent end of divine miracle leaves the uniformity of nature to the undisturbed operation of natural law. Our appeal against legendary miracle rests firmly on the close of the canon, on one side, and the general uniformity of nature on the other. Froude sneers at the distinction; but we shall see farther that it is capable of a just defence. The miracle of the Gospels and the miracle of the Calendar rest on totally different foundations; and there is no inconsistency in accepting the one class and rejecting the other. Mere miracle of benevolence, as the legendary miracle is called, apart from revelation, finds no countenance in the word of God. Christ performed many miracles of benevolence, but they were all done that His works might bear witness of Him. In all cases of Gospel miracle the relation of the act of power to a revelation from God was entirely apparent. Where there is no revelation, there is no true miracle. This test sweeps wholly away the long list of legendary wonders, and wholly discredits them as *the finger of God*, whatever else they may be.

2. The second grand mark of true miracle, discriminating it from false, is that true miracle is *never done in favor of a religion already established: it always has a constructive or a revolutionary purpose*. It is the signature always of a fresh revelation from God, and is designed either to give an original statement of truth from heaven, or to authorize the development of an old, already divinely established system into a new form. God alone has the right to do either; and for either His power must certify His will when revealed through subordinate agents. All the miracle of the Old Testament was done to confirm the successive revelations to the

ancient Church. The miracle of the New was to authorize the changes of the old law and the old functions of the Church, which altered it from a stationary and non-propagandist institution into a positive instrument of aggression. This test again sweeps away the miracles of the Calendar; they are all, according to their own theory, miracles of benevolence not only apart from revelation, but in favor of a faith already established, but which is conceived still to need the support of perpetual miracle. True miracle invariably possesses an original or a revolutionary purpose. The miracle of the Roman Calendar is purely conservative, so far as its purpose is concerned; it is done in the presence of witnesses interested in the established faith, and under circumstances which cannot possibly lend any additional or independent weight to the allegation of fact or the support of the truth.

3. The *third* mark of true miracle which distinguishes it from all false miracle, is that the action done must be wrought in consistency with the character and dignity of Almighty God, and that the act must authenticate itself, both in its *intrinsic dignity* and in its definite demonstration of *divine supernatural power*. That any act performed by the direct energy of the divine will, for the purpose of certifying truth involving the eternal interests of an immortal race, must possess an intrinsic dignity worthy of the actor and worthy of his purpose, is intuitively obvious. This test alone is sufficient to discredit the so-called miracles of the Apocryphal New Testament—a collection of spurious writings of an early age of the Christian era. The book attempts to delineate the incidents in the youth and unrecorded portion of the life of Christ. He is represented as exercising miraculous power in childhood, and, for puerile purposes, turning dirt-pies into food, making birds of mud, and causing His to fly, which the mud-birds of His companions could not do, and withering the arm of a playmate who had angered Him. Such allegations are discredited upon the statement of them. Yet an immense proportion of the multitudes of miracles which are said to be constantly performed in the bosom of the Papal body, are of little or no more dignity than these absurdities of the Apocryphal New Testament. Two crows were long exhibited in Lisbon which were said to have saved a ship from wreck and guided

it into port. An image, found by a dog in a hole, is said to have wrought miraculous cures. A hole is said to have been made in a marble slab by the fall of the host upon its surface in order to convince an infidel. The Bambino of Ara-Coeli, an image of the Virgin about two feet high, is represented as walking to the convent where it usually remained, ringing the bell, and gaining admittance late at night. The Virgin is represented as mercifully interposing when an overloaded ass fell under his burden. St. Dennis once walked after his head was cut off, carrying his head in his hands. St. Martin crossed the Mediterranean on his cloak. St. Scholastica raised a storm to keep St. Benedict one night in her convent in order that she might enjoy the benefit of his conversation. Impressions of the five wounds of Christ are not unfrequently made on the bodies of favored individuals—a feat in substance done in New York a few years ago, both by a spiritualist medium and by an ordinary juggler. The Roman Breviary—the standard rule of Papal devotion—constantly in the hands of the priests for their guidance, is full of assertions of just such statements. With no disposition to be harsh in the judgment of such things, we are profoundly convinced that every candid, common-sense mind must at once perceive the incongruity between such acts and the ascription of them to the infinite God. These seem to be the highest forms in which the disciplined intellect of the Roman priesthood can conceive of miraculous acts. How vast the difference between these conceptions and the simple but grand delineations of the fishermen of Galilee! It is a difference which can only be accounted for on the supposition that they simply related facts in the history of the Nazarene, and the grandeur and majesty was *in the facts* and not in their superior conception of the possible in miracle. The miracles of Moses and the old prophets of the Messiah and the apostles were on a scale of sublimity which the human understanding intuitively recognizes as worthy of God to perform. The judgments on Egypt, the passage of the millions of Israel through the sea; the fire falling from heaven on the drenched altar of Carmel; the camp of the Assyrian, with its 185,000 dead soldiers, lying dead in the pale moonlight under their unstruck banners; the chariot of fire whirling down on the travelling prophets, the raising of the dead, the storm

bridled as it rushed over the midnight lake, the earthquake and midday darkness at the crucifixion, the healing and feeding of thousands—to compare these grand actions with such puerile follies as the Roman Calendar affords shocks every sensibility of the soul. Yet, in the judgment of Mr. Froude—a man of high and brilliant abilities, one of the leading literary lights of his age—the miracles of the Calendar “resemble and rival those of the New Testament.” Can prejudice go farther in extinguishing the power of perception in a gifted intellect? It is an infinitely greater degradation to make the comparison than to match the drivelling chatter of an idiot with the awful majestic eloquence of a Milton reciting the grand epic of the fall and redemption of man. All such actions as the miracles of the Bible carry their significance on their face; no power but divine could produce such effects. True miracle authenticates itself. False miracle, even if the fact be admitted, is never above the power of beings and agencies inferior to Deity, and is, certainly for the most part, discredited even as facts by the mixture of absurdity and extravagance carried on its front.

4. The fourth grand test of true miracle, which supports its own claim and distinguishes it from all forms of imposture, is, that the miraculous action must be something plain, definite, clearly cognizable by the senses, and level to the apprehension of ordinary men—instantaneous in its result, and performed without the intervention of second causes which might possibly be sufficient to account for the effect. The object of miracle is to authenticate a message from God—to give sanction to the credentials of His ambassador. The certificate must be public to affect the convictions of those to whom the message is sent. It must be plain and easily apprehended, cognizable by the senses and incapable of misapprehension, or else it will fail of its purpose as testimony. This test is fully met by the miracle of the Gospel; it is altogether unmet by the overwhelming majority of the miracles of the Calendar. The few of the latter, which are exhibited in anything like a public manner, are manifestly not beyond the reach of skilful management and the combination of natural forces. The miracle of St. Januarius’ blood is frequently repeated in view of crowded audiences. A small ball of a red color enclosed

in a glass vessel is made to liquefy without any apparent cause. The result is not beyond the reach of chemical manipulations, and fails utterly to impress any disinterested beholder with any, even the least, apprehension of the presence and exercise of divine energy. Such an impression could not fail to be felt in the presence of such an act as the raising of Lazarus or the feeding of the multitudes in the wilderness. The celebrated miracles performed at the tomb of the Abbe de Paris in 1789 and the cures at St. Winifred's well are subject to discount on more than one consideration, and are explainable on natural principles. However justly the allegation of a general or even a frequent realization of hope on the part of the devotees who resort to such mystical localities may be impeached, it is not necessary to deny every asserted case of cure at those places. We are ready to admit every one that is proved. The power of excited expectation, of faith and roused imagination is medicinally very great—so great that a distinguished German school of medicine (that of Stahl) was actually founded upon it as a principle of practice. The authenticated cases of cure at St. Winifred's well and at similar resorts in the dominions of Romanism are probably not much greater in number than the authenticated cases of the cure of scrofula by the kings of England, when the practice of touching for the king's evil was an usage of the English crown. In both cases the same natural force was to be credited with the result—the same principle utilized by Stahl in his theory and practice of medicine—the same principle by which every treatise upon mental science illustrates the power of the imagination over the states of the body. Miracle to effect its purpose must stand clear of all such possible discounts ; it must authenticate itself. It must authenticate itself to the public view—to the senses and judgment of the average man, and leave no room to account for it from excited expectation, from blind confidence, from shrewd arrangements, from inferior beings (natural or supernatural). It must manifest clearly *the finger of God* or it is worthless.

5. The *fifth* grand test of true miracle is, that it shall be performed in the presence of witnesses of an indiscriminate character as friendly or unfriendly, undesignedly brought together, and the act incidentally done and without formal prep-

aration. It is not necessary that every individual miracle should be able to pass this test, or one or two more which will be mentioned. These mighty actions are generally developed in a *system* or series of miracle marking some grand addition or transition in the store of divine knowledge or the ordinances of the Kingdom. The *system*, as a whole, must be able to stand this test, and thus the authority of the vast bulk which is done in public will uphold the few isolated instances done in circumstances of less publicity and in the presence of chosen or limited witnesses. The object of miracle, to authenticate a commission from God, intended to embrace men generally in its influence, makes it necessary to address the *public* mind. This publicity is also necessary to the completeness of the proof of miracle, when, by the lapse of time and events, it is transmitted beyond the eye-witnesses of the facts. The incidental, and, so far as human arrangements are concerned, undesigned performance of the act in the presence of witnesses of indiscriminate character undesignedly brought together, is needful to repel all suspicion of craft and management, either in the production of the result or in a *packed and pre-arranged proof of it*. This test is met by the Gospel miracle; it is not met by the miracle of the Calendar. The vast majority of these latter acts is done in private — often with no witness whatever—often in the presence of a few interested in securing acceptance of the coming wonder, and disqualified as witnesses by personal defects, or by the circumstances in which they were brought in contact with objects of their testimony. The miracle of the Calendar is often performed in apartments of religious houses, in which the possible facilities for the management of a scenic display are without assignable limits. They are witnessed by devotees—either weak, and as such easily deceived, or bigoted in favor of the expected demonstration, and as such ready to receive any desired impression; or else unable to penetrate the whole case, and thus incapable of testifying to the whole case, no matter how generally intelligent or worthy of confidence they may be. The miracle of St. Januarius' blood is not only discredited by the fact that the liquefaction is not beyond the reach of chemical arrangements, but by the fact of an incompetent scrutiny by witnesses otherwise altogether reliable.

No doubt the liquefaction takes place ; but the pre-arranged scene, the place, the mechanical recurrence of the wonder at the will of the authorities, the actors, and the entire deficiency of any opportunities of a preliminary or concurrent investigation—all these features discredit it as a true exhibition of divine power. On the other hand, the miracle of the Gospel was done in open daylight, on public streets and highways, in the crowded temple and on the densely-thronged mountain's side, in villages and towns, in houses filled with an indiscriminate multitude of eager but non-partisan beholders—before scribe and Pharisee, priest and doctor of the law—jealous, watchful, filled with keen and vehement desire to disbelieve themselves and discredit to others all that was done. There was no secret preparation, no formal discrimination of witnesses to secure those who were friendly or exclude those who were hostile. The objection to the proof of the resurrection of Christ, drawn from His not showing Himself to the Jewish public, but only to selected witnesses, though all were not selected, is removed by the number of the witnesses, by the reluctance of many of them to accept the fact, by the subsequent history of the twelve official witnesses, and the profound change of temper wrought in them by the fact, and especially by three whole years and upwards of miraculous power displayed by Christ himself. This appearance after the rising to between five and six hundred witnesses is redeemed from all just suspicion and vindicated by its own peculiar reasons, into which we cannot enter now. Standing in a *system* of public miracle, it is freed from the censure of not complying with the test of publicity. As for the general system of the Messiah's miracle, it was marked by publicity in a degree so complete as to make the notion of deception in the acts or incompetence in the proof absolutely impossible. Suppose an analogous case : Surely if for three years past, in every part of a State of the American Republic, in its capital and chief towns, in its villages and country districts, before the thronging thousands of the people, before its rulers (civil and religious), its lawyers and educated intellect of every class—before multitudes, friendly, hostile, indifferent, and simply curious—if on such a theatre as that a thousand acts of miraculous power had been done by one man, surely there could be no possi-

bility of questioning the facts or impeaching the proof of them. To compare a publicity like this with a scenic show like the display of St. Januarius, is to mock the understanding. To make the proof in both cases equally respectable in the demand of credence, is absurd.

6. The sixth grand test and distinction of true miracle is that not only must the act be done in the face of the public, but that in some cases *public tests* must *be applied* at the time—examinations held by other than friends of the new doctrine. This is another of the tests which are not necessary to be applied to every act of miracle, but only to crucial cases. Science never deems it necessary that the entire body of the facts on any given subject should be examined; a sufficient number of them to fairly represent the force which produces or the law which governs them, is deemed altogether sufficient for scientific purposes. Renan, in his treatment of this point in the Christian theory, is singularly unfortunate. He claims that the only reliable investigation that could have been made should have been done by an assembly of scientific savants, and denies positively that any investigation was ever made at all, into any of the acts performed by Jesus. It is obvious as a reply to the first count in his objection, that he has confounded an examination *into a fact*, for which other than scientific men are fully competent, with an examination into the *cause* of the fact, for which only scientific men, possibly, might be competent. In this whole war upon miracle the proof of *facts* is perpetually confounded with the proof of *causes*. The nature of the *power* employed is perpetually confounded with the fact which is developed. The nature of the power employed is an *inference* from the fact, but cannot logically be either confounded with the fact or employed to discredit it. Even if a scientific habit of mind is needful to guarantee the inferences, it is certainly not necessary to the examination and proof of the fact. A fact is a reality subject to the cognizance of all men, and the apologetic power of miracle, is that the fact warrants no other assignment of cause than creative power. An instance of this is really as cognizable by the ordinary as by the scientific mind. A peasant would be no more at a loss to understand the nature of the energy present when a dead man is brought back into life, than a savant. It

is all-sufficient as a reply to the point made by Renan, that a congress of scientists is not necessary to the proof of facts ; a convention of average men is fully competent to do it. Moreover, Christlieb has justly remarked that the French Academy, which at one time rejected all faith in lightning-rods, vaccination, and the existence of meteorites, might have proved no more trustworthy in their judgment of miracles. A scientific body is far from infallible, even in its own sphere, the search for causes, and cannot command confidence merely on their scientific character and apart from their rendered reasons. But in a question of fact and not of causes, it is obviously inadmissible to deny the value of all investigation except that which is purely scientific.

Renan is even more unfortunate in the second count in his objection ; he flatly denies that any investigation at all was ever made into any miraculous act of Jesus, at the time of the occurrence. He deserves the curt rebuke of Christlieb, for a want of candor or a want of memory. Two cases underwent examination, one on a deliberate and the other on a repeated scale. The case of the man born blind, restored to sight by a word of Christ, was examined at length by an assembly of eager enemies of the Nazarene, and the examination is reported at length in one entire chapter of one of the Gospels. The parents of the man were examined on one part of the case ; the man himself was examined and rigorously cross-examined, and all in public. Bethany was visited over and over again by crowds from Jerusalem to see Lazarus after he was raised from the dead. The facts in this case were of such a kind as to admit of no dispute ; and the result of this repeated investigation by so many persons was so powerful on the public judgment, that the enemies of the Nazarene absolutely plotted against the life of Lazarus, to extinguish the influence of that wonderful event in his history. No such open and scrutinizing canvass of the facts by the general public and by the enemies of the system has ever marked a miracle of the Calendar. In the development of legendary miracle there has been a laborious travesty of the marks and evidence of true miracle ; but none have ever been invented of a character to command the confidence of a candid and impartial understanding. The miracle of the Gospel, in true test cases, was

submitted to the unrestricted scrutiny of the best educated and the most hostile intellect of the time, as well as to the repeated examination of the general public; and the facts were not only proved, but *admitted*. The very enemies of the Gospel testified to the facts, when they attempted to account for them by satanic agency; something must have been done by the admission of the Pharisees themselves which Satan alone in their judgment could do.

7. The seventh grand test of true miracle which profoundly distinguishes it from false, is that the alleged facts should be generally recognized, not by the partisans of the new system exclusively, but *by the universal public of the day as actual occurrences, known to the public*—not by the testimony of advocates, but by their own acquaintance with the events. The whole proof of the Gospel is sometimes treated as if it depended alone on the testimony of the apostles; they were the official, but not the only witnesses. They give us the detail of the facts, but indisputable facts outside of their personal credibility, *make all the public* of the time witnesses to the truth of their narrative. It is historically demonstrable, that out of the life of Jesus, and as the result of His doctrine, a new institute then came upon the stage. It won thousands of the Jewish people into its discipline; even a great company of the hostile priests at last became obedient to the faith. The apostles boldly appealed to the miracles of Christ as the ground on which they claimed obedience to the Gospel. They boldly appealed to the people's own knowledge of these wonderful manifestations. They boldly asserted that "Jesus of Nazareth was a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by Him in the midst of you, *as yourselves also know*." They did not even pretend or attempt to prove these actions by their own testimony; they appealed to the knowledge of the people themselves as to the facts. They declared as matter of fact that these things had been done in the midst of the people, and that they knew it. Such a procedure was absolute insanity—it could not be called lying—if the statement was not true. Suppose a parallel case: Suppose a man should appear in this country with the design of establishing a new religion and uprooting Christianity, interwoven, as it is, with the highest interests of the existing

civil order and fixed in the affections and prejudices of the people. Suppose he should appeal as his warrant to make the new development, to miracles alleged to have been performed for the last three years, in city and village, in town and country, in the presence of thousands of the people in every section of the land. Suppose he should allege that these things were known to the whole people—not upon his say so, but on their own knowledge. Suppose now, that there was not one word of truth in the whole allegation. *What effect* would be produced by it? Certainly it would scarcely excite a smile; the allegation would be too transparently absurd to arrest any serious attention. Perhaps some of the more humane would think of providing a place in a lunatic asylum for the poor victim of mental hallucination. But it is absolutely certain that not a ripple would appear on the surface of society. But now suppose that the assertion was true, and that for three years and upward, in every part of the land, the dead had been raised, the sick healed, the blind cured, and miraculous power had been really manifested in manifold forms before the eyes of the public everywhere. Suppose the propagandists of the new faith should go forth calling the people to accept it, appealing to the facts and their own knowledge of them. What would be the effect in this case? Assuredly, society would be stirred to its foundations; the new institutions would grow rapidly into a power in society, and appear upon its surface; *and this effect would be the testimony of the public to the facts.* The overthrow of the existing system and the erection of the new, as the result of an appeal to the people's own knowledge of the facts, would make them even *more impressive witnesses* to the facts than the official promulgation of the new discipline. Thus in point of fact the rise of the Christian Church, the renunciation of the old faith, and the acceptance of the new by vast multitudes of the Jewish people, and of the hostile priests, is the embodied confirmation of the official witnesses by the Jewish people. No general public, by their own independent knowledge, have ever given any testimony, much less such testimony as this, to the miracle of the Calendar.

8. The eighth grand test is found in the public and permanently organized arrangements made to preserve the facts,

and to secure the transmission of them to all coming time. The conditions of a reliable transmission of facts and evidence through indefinite periods have been already explained. This whole elaborate arrangement was made to secure the miraculous facts and doctrines of Christianity. A record was made by eye-witnesses of the facts, by men who were in close attendance on the person of Christ during His whole public life. A living organization capable of an endless succession was provided. The voice of the living teacher daily and weekly proclaiming the facts, has never ceased to be heard since the reorganization of the Church on its new propagandist basis eighteen centuries ago. We know these facts were proclaimed two, six, ten, eighteen hundred years ago, because the daily and weekly proclamation has never ceased. Memorial monuments of the most striking and indestructible character were established. A change in the Sabbath day from the seventh to the first day of the week is a memorial of the resurrection of Christ. Bread and wine, made symbolically and religiously significant, are the memorial of His death. The organization of the Church, and the whole series of its acts of worship, are memorials of the influence and authority of the Nazarene, as much as Mormon institutions are of the Mormon founder. From the beginning of Christ's public ministry, His system was at once interwoven with the history of the Jewish nation, and in no long time became linked with the history and legislation of the Roman Empire. Tiberius very early proposed to admit Christ among the gods of Rome. Tacitus spoke with stern contempt of the "*exitiabilis superstitio*" of Chrestus. For the long period of three hundred years in ten distinct persecutions, the whole power of the empire under Nero, Diocletian, Decian, and Galerian, was exerted with remorseless energy to extinguish the victorious faith of the Galilean. Within fifty years of the death of the last apostle, a Christian apologist could say to the Roman Emperor, "We are but of yesterday, and we have filled all that belongs to you: the cities, the fortresses, the free towns, the very camps, the palace, the senate, the forum—we leave to you the temples only." All that tremendous energy of faith, by which old men and maidens, senators and noble ladies, soldiers of the legions, and plebeians of the imperial city triumphed

over the persecuting power of that remorseless government, testifies to the power of the truth as it is in Jesus. From that time three-fourths of the recorded history of many nations of the human race, and a grand proportion of human legislation, is concerned with the interests of Christianity—all of whose claims to faith and obedience are avowedly based upon three years of miracle and divine doctrine in the brief life of the Nazarene. On the supposition that the facts are real, the result is natural and somewhat proportionate. On the denial of the facts, the record, the endless organization, the memorial monuments, and the tremendous movement of human history, are absolutely unaccountable anomalies! Where can the miracle of the Calendar show such an arrangement to authenticate itself and prevent the erasure of the sign-manual of God, by the rush of time and events? *No facts of human history* can show any parallel or even comparable provisions to secure their transmission. *No events in human history* can trace back to their origin by a line of transmission so complete and so powerful as the miracles of the Gospel.

9. The *ninth* grand test of true miracle is *prophetic announcement beforehand*. The sceptic must deal with the historical and literary fact of a record confessedly several hundred years in existence before Christ appeared, which, after describing a great number and variety of minute circumstances connected with His history and person, distinctly announced that this predicted messenger from God would perform many miracles. The blind would see, the dumb sing, the deaf hear, and the lame man leap as the hart. Isaiah's prophecy is extant in the Septuagint Version, which is as well known to have been made near three centuries before the birth of Christ as that the Bible was translated into English in the time of James I. It is extant in the Hebrew Scriptures centuries before the Septuagint. This prophetic test covered all the miracles of Christ. Moses foretold his own miracles to Pharaoh. Joshua was before informed and fore-announced the fall of Jericho. Christ told the seventy as He sent them out, they should exert a miraculous power. Prophecy always goes in a closer or more remote relation to miracle. This test discredits all the miracles of the Calendar. The only prophecy connected with them completes their discredit; it is the prediction of them as

"the lying wonders of the man of sin." This prophetic test is of correlated force; the prophecy confirms the miracle, and the miracle demonstrates the prophecy to be true fore-knowledge. In the light of this close and apparently universal connection between miracle and its previous announcement, we have a right to discredit all miracle which cannot disclose its correlated member in a prophetic advertisement, if not of each separate act, yet of the general commission of the agent to perform such works. The apologetic work of the test is great. The previous announcement challenges attention and challenges *fulfilment*; it discriminates the act more clearly when it is done. It strongly confirms faith, not only as in itself an additional instance of miraculous knowledge combined with an act of power, but because it is a deliberate challenge of divine energy which can never be the instrument of deception; and when this challenge is answered by the power invoked, the demonstration is complete on both sides of the correlation between the miracle of knowledge and the miracle of power.

10. The tenth test of true miracle is *variety and wealth* of action. Impostors in religion economize in this species of proof by miracle, and sink the dignity and variety of action in the interests of practicability. They never undertake anything of special dignity or greatness for fear of failure in the execution of it, and restrict themselves to a line of action undistinguished by any greatness or variety of invention. The miracles of the Calendar, which, taking the whole period in which they are said to have occurred, count up by thousands, are graduated on a scale of insignificance in both these respects. The healing of disease, the elevation of the human body in the air, visible appearances of the Virgin and the saints, victorious physical combats with the devil in person, winking and weeping images, and mysterious marks upon the human body, are the chief forms of miracle in the conception of the architects of the Calendar. Of the Gospel miracle only about *forty* are on detailed record. There is something of conscious power in this stern economy of recital. This specific detail is no index to what was actually done. Incidental allusions are made to multitudes of these wondrous acts. Great multitudes are represented as resorting to the Nazarene, bringing the sick from far and near, and the record says, "He

healed them all." Several distinct allusions of this kind, at different periods in the narrative, are suggestive of a wonderful multiplication of individual acts of miraculous energy. The three and a half years of Christ's public ministry glow like the star-fretted midnight, with His wondrous works. The whole age resounds with the footsteps of God walking among men. At what period they ceased is not easy to tell, except in a general way, that they ceased when the revelation of God, through special agents of His will, came to an end. When a sufficiency of recorded evidence was placed in the hands of the endless order of the Church to secure a rational credence in all the coming ages, the inspired record of these facts was closed, and the miracle of apostle and apostolic men, outside of this record, was employed to give currency to their teaching and authority to their legislation in the special fields of their personal labor. As only a portion of the twelve were engaged in the composition of the record, it is morally certain that a large amount of apostolic miracle was never reliably or at all recorded. But doubtless the law of correlation between revelation and miracle ruled throughout the miraculous period and marked its close. Enough was gathered into the canonical record to serve all the ends of testimony to the truth. Not only a *wealth* of production, but a noble *variety* of sublime conceptions was realized in the miracle of the Gospel. The raising of the dead, the cure of disease in manifold forms, the feeding of the enthusiastic and fainting multitudes in the wilderness, the repair of broken senses and useless limbs, the command exerted over animal nature, over storms and the agitated sea, over the light of the sun and the steadiness of the earth, and over the constitution of bread, water, and wine, indicate at once the wide range and the grand conception of the Gospel miracle. In reply to the objection raised against the test of greatness and dignity in true miracle in the *Saturday Review* of April 29, 1876, the following remarks may be sufficient: The writer excepts to this test on the ground that "it does not discredit every individual instance of Calendar miracle, nor apply to every individual instance of the miracle of the Scriptures." According to this reasoning no general rule can be accepted as such, unless it is exclusive of all exceptions. This is obviously inadmissible. Admit that indi-

vidual instances of suitable dignity are claimed for Calendar miracle and similar instances of familiar action are attributable to Gospel miracle, the admission certainly does not destroy the unquestionable prevailing character of both—the one as marked by lowness and the other by sublimity of conception. Nay, in some of the favorite instances of hostile criticism, on which sceptics frequently dwell with scornful pleasure, it is clear that the full significance of the action is overlooked. Take, for instance, the rod of Moses turned into a serpent, devouring the serpent-rods of the Egyptian priests. It is well known that the animal and reptile creation afforded symbols of the divine power to the old Egyptian, and were worshipped as such. It is also said that there was a peculiar serpent, or what is more likely, that the priests were in possession of a peculiar process by which a serpent could be stiffened into the likeness of a rod or magician's wand, and restored to animation and motion at will. This power over serpents, and the symbolism of the Supreme power by means of serpents, gave peculiar influence over the multitude to the artful priesthood of Osiris. It was, therefore, a noble and rational policy, worthy of God, to discredit the false gods and the deceitful priesthood of the Egyptians by showing, through the peculiar method of this miracle, how powerless they were in conflict with the true and living God. The purpose of Moses was to secure credit to the word of command which he brought from Jehovah to the Egyptian monarch, and it was entirely germane to his purpose to overthrow the influence of the gods of Egypt over his mind. The speech of Balaam's ass is another stock-instance of sceptical merriment. The use of the organs of an animal to convey intelligence from a spiritual being unembodied to another intelligent spirit in a body and confined to bodily organs as the instruments of its knowing and acting, is certainly not irrational in itself, provided it is practicable. If the skill of man can draw articulate speech from a raven or a parrot, it would not seem to be irrational to suppose that infinite power could extract it from the organs of an ass. That it *is* impracticable, at the least, cannot be proved; and why a thing, not obviously irrational and not capable of being proved to be impracticable, should be construed as an obvious subject for contempt, it is not so easy to conceive. If we knew all the circumstances sur-

rounding those miracles of Scripture which are supposed to be deficient in dignity, it is altogether probable they would be quite as capable of vindication as the miracle of Moses in the court of Pharaoh. In an age, not far advanced from barbarism, among a people among whose scanty virtues a profound reverence for old age held a high position, there may have been a peculiar energy of wickedness in the mockery of Elisha by the rude boys of an Arab camp to justify a judgment of God in the form of wild beasts or the spears of a hostile tribe. It may also have been the case that the prophet was known and the insult was to his official character, not to his person or age, and as such an insult to the majesty of God himself. If we knew the whole case, criticism might be disarmed. The axe raised from the water may have sustained peculiar relations to the training of the school of young religious teachers which the prophet was instructing. The accidental touching of a dead body by the bones of a prophet may have sustained relations to some previous teachings of the prophet, as made a miracle through the unconscious agency of his bones important to the purpose of the divine government. We do not know all the circumstances of the case in these instances of Scripture miracle, and in the absence of knowledge to the contrary, an impartial and candid criticism will be disposed to give them the benefit of a presumed sufficient reason. Besides this line of vindication, it may be that the analogy of God's works of *providence*, and of the mode of teaching He has employed in His *word*, may be carried into His miraculous *action*. In general, He speaks to be understood; occasionally He speaks with studied obscurity in His word. His providence is generally benevolent to sinful men; occasionally it does His strange work—vengeance. There cannot be a doubt that the general character of true miracle is grave, elevated, and even sublime; occasionally He may use His sovereignty of will in actions familiar and common. The purpose to test the temper in which men construe His ways is a ruling element in His administration of grace, and by these instances of miracle He may incidentally design a test of character and candor toward Himself. Even admitting the instances to be all the sceptic would construe them to be, they are the exceptions only to a true general rule; they do not discredit the general character of Gospel miracle

for a grandeur worthy of their author and their end. Properly and fully understood in their circumstances, and not merely in the bare statement of the supernatural effect, they may, for all any one can now know, sustain this character even in the apparently exceptional instances, if they are exceptional. Nor will an individual instance of dignified miracle in the Calendar series at all redeem their general character as low in conception.

II. The *eleventh* test of true miracle, distinguishing it strongly from the miracle of the Calendar, is *the infrequency of their occurrence*. The rival class is graduated on a scale just the reverse, on the assertion of a *perpetual system* of miracle, co-existent with the life of the Church, and alleged to be necessary to sustain it. This necessity is discredited by the actual effects of the system; instead of confirming faith it breeds infidelity. This result is legitimate. The allegation reflects dishonor on the previous provisions made by God, to secure the rational belief of mankind, by implying their insufficiency. It reflects upon His moral and providential administration; on the one, as providing superfluous proof in deference to unreasonable unbelief; on the other, as allowing a perpetual interruption of His regular system of administration. The miracle of the Gospel, while making an ample display of *power*, during an epoch of miraculous intervention, does not permit such an epoch to appear except at rare and necessary periods. It appears only when some revelation of truth of infinite importance to an immortal race of sinful creatures is to be made. As the Providential Ruler of the universe, God guides His administration by a general system of laws. The laws of nature are the determinate effects of His *will*; they are the expressions of His will; they indicate that it is His choice and purpose that effects shall follow causes in a certain regular sequence, capable of being known and conformed to by creatures of intelligence and will. To allow of a constant reversal of those laws is tantamount to a *contradiction of His will*. To allow such an interference at rare periods, for a great and vitally important moral purpose, involving the eternal interests of an immortal race, is altogether admissible; human reason can see nothing unreasonable or incredible in such a conception. But perpetual reverse of law is a contradiction in itself and involves it in the will of God. It is altogether inadmissible, either on

the ground of fact or possibility, and the very foundation of the Calendar miracle is swept away by this test. The notion of perpetual testimonial miracle is at war with every just conception of the divine administration.

12. The twelfth test of true miracle is found in the character and work of *the official witnesses*. As before remarked, the credit of Christianity does not stand *alone* upon the testimony of the twelve apostles. Only a portion of them were concerned in the construction of the record. They were the official teachers and witnesses of the new development, but not by any means the only witnesses. The whole public of Jewry were witnesses, and the changes in the society of the day is the demonstration of their undesigned testimony. The *work* of the apostles, which is independent of all consideration of their character, is an independent source of evidence to the truth. These men were selected to proclaim the facts and doctrines in the system of the great teacher; to extend still further the revelation from God, and to organize the institutions growing out of them. The testimony of these men is threefold in character: it consists *first* in what they *are themselves*; *second*, in what they *said*; *third*, in what they *did*. Their credibility is unimpeachable on all their grounds. They were men of sound minds; this is evident from their writings. They were men of transparent candor, as evinced by their whole relation of the facts, by their self-sacrifice, by their resolute confidence in their own statements, by the loss of all for the testimony they bore. They were plain and unlettered men of a low rank in society, for the most part, and it is not supposable that in such mere ambition and the *éclat* of establishing a new religion would overbalance the loss of all things which such a class would be likely to value. Conscious impostors in founding a new religion always provide for securing their personal interests in this life, and a sure part in the promise of the future. These men encountered the loss of all things in this world; and the lofty system they taught condemned all liars, and themselves if they lied, to endless wretchedness. They gained poverty, persecution, imprisonment, wanderings without end over sea and land, the scourge and vengeance of the religious systems they assailed; yet they never flinched from testifying to the facts and doctrines of the Gos-

pel. A refined and intense ambition might tempt a single intense and resolute intellect to hazard much to establish a new faith, in the success of which he might indemnify himself for the sufferings incident to the attempt. But it is wholly incredible that twelve plain men, giving no one of them indications of any peculiar ambition, should sacrifice home, friends, ease, and security, for danger, suffering, incessant labor, and death itself for a lie of which they were the conscious authors. They did evidently believe, with intense conviction, what they taught others to believe. That they were not deceived is clear from their incessant appeals to the knowledge of the facts by the people to whom they first preached; self-delusion, however honest, could give them no hold on a people not similarly deluded. If ever witnesses were credible on the ground of faultless personal competency, the official witnesses of Gospel miracle were worthy of confidence.

But independent of their personal character, the work these men did, testifies irresistibly to the truth of what they declared. This work is of varied character. Take the delineation of the character and purposes of Christ—a delineation which is as real as a work of literary art as the character of Lear or Hamlet. They describe by artless touches a character so unique, so simple, so grand, so beautiful, that it stands alone in the history, as it does in the literature of mankind, a character which commands the reverence of all men, and which even the leading infidel intellects of the age have united to praise as something absolutely beyond comparison. This delineated character of Christ is a demonstration of the truth of what they say of Him. It could not possibly have been due to the natural genius of these uncultured fishermen, in the sense in which the character of Hamlet was due to the genius of Shakespeare. It would be as well to suppose that wondrous creation was the work of a dozen of the scene-shifters and candle-snuffers of the Globe or the Blackfriars theatre, or that the Transfiguration of Raphael was the work of a dozen small negro artists, whose only culture in art had been sketches in charcoal on a cellar-door. The notion is preposterous. The possibility of the achievement lay in only one thing, and that is, that these men simply related what they had seen a living person say and do; and the unparalleled splendor and perfection of the por-

traiture lay in the history and qualities of that living man, and not in their conceptions of the ideally perfect in human character. Considered on their character, these witnesses are competent; independent of their character, their work certifies itself. The delineation of Christ is true, because it was impossible unless true.

But this is only a sample of their work. Add to this the development of the purest and loftiest system of practical morality, the grandest theories of the universe; the most profound and skilfully adjusted system of doctrine and the founding of the most remarkable institution in human history, the reorganized Church of the old covenant—all these are the work of the Galilean fishermen. The Christian theory is, that they did it under the inspiration of God. The sceptical theory is, that they did it under the inspiration of their own genius. This theory is utterly incredible. On the Christian theory all is plain, for the cause is adequate to the effects. To crown their credibility as witnesses to the miracle and doctrine of Jesus, they themselves, as charged with a further extension of the new revelation, worked miracles. This is admitted even by the Talmud. It is repeatedly recorded and affirmed in the New Testament. It is confirmed by the early and unpolluted traditions of the Church. This fact might constitute a distinct test of true miracle in its conflict with the miracle of the Calendar. The testimony of the Gospel miracle is confirmed in its official witnesses by miracle. No such indorsement is claimed for the miracle of the Roman saints as a divine certificate of their *witnesses*.

13. The *thirteenth* and last test and evidence of true miracle, by which it is honorably distinguished from all false miracle, is the testimony and assent of the enemies of the Gospel to the facts. For seventeen centuries these facts were not questioned even by the infidels of the ages as they succeeded. Celsus and Porphyry, Hierocles and Julian, all admitted the facts and ascribed them to magic. Jewish writers join in the same testimony. Josephus, in a passage so clear that no refuge is left to the sceptic but an attack on the genuineness of the writing, gives important evidence; and even if the passage has been interpolated to a certain extent, of which we have no

reliable proof, it is incredible the whole passage is spurious, and its importance cannot be destroyed. He says :

"Now there was about this time, Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man ; for he performed many wonderful works. He was a teacher of such men as received the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him many of the Jews and also many of the Gentiles. This was the Christ. And when Pilate, at the instigation of the principal men among us, had condemned him to the cross, those who had loved him from the first, did not cease to adhere to him. For he appeared to them alive again, on the third day, the divine prophets having foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him. And the tribe or sect of Christians, so named from him, subsists to this time."

The Talmud, which is a collection of old Jewish traditional doctrines, first committed to writing about the middle of the second century of the Christian era—probably not more than fifty years after the death of the last apostle,—amid many strongly hostile sentiments toward the Nazarene, openly acknowledges that He did many wonderful works. The Talmudic writers ascribe the facts they admit, to His having acquired the right pronounciation of the Shemmahphorah, or the ineffable name of God, which they say He stole out of the Temple. They also ascribe them in part to the arts of magic, which He is said to have learned in Egypt. The Talmud also gives instances of miracle wrought by the apostles, and accounts for them in the same discreditable way.

Another remarkable testimony from a source not friendly, if not positively hostile, is to be found in the reports of the pro-consular or procuratorial government of Pontius Pilate, to the Imperial Government at Rome. It was an established usage of the Roman administration to require regular reports from all the provinces of the Empire, and in this way all occurrences worthy of note in every section were laid up in the national archives. Under this rule, it might have been expected that Pilate would transmit an account of the marvellous transactions in Judea during his administration. The reports from the provinces were called *Acta*, and while no more intended for general circulation than any other official papers, they were accessible to scholars and inquirers of every class and afforded material for the historian. That Pilate did send an official report touching the history and execution of Christ, to the Roman Government, is proved by the indisputable fact that the Christian apologists, for more than two centuries, appealed to the *Acta Pilati* in the public archives, as confirm-

atory of the teachings of the Church. In various public documents petitioning for mercy, addressed to the Emperor and the Senate, they appeal to this documentary evidence in the Government archives. Thus Justyn Martyr, in an address to Antoninus Pius about A.D. 140, follows his narrative of the crucifixion by this bold appeal: "And that these things were so done, you may know from the Acts made in the time of Pontius Pilate." After relating some of the miracles of Christ, he appeals to the archive document again as containing the same statements. Tertullian, about A.D. 200, after speaking of the crucifixion, the resurrection from the dead, and the ascension into heaven, adds this statement: "Of all these things relating to Christ, Pilate himself, in his conscience already a Christian, *sent an account* to Tiberius, then Emperor." That Pilate did report the facts to Rome is not only proved by the constant appeal of the Christian apologists to the *Acta Pilati*, but is in a high moral probability supported by the unquestionable historical fact that the Emperor Tiberius, very early, about A.D. 52—within nineteen years of the death of Christ—formally proposed to the Senate to decree him a place among the gods of Rome. On what information did he proceed? No doubt the public bruit of the wonderful history was wide spread and widely received to have justified such a proposal; but if we suppose the official report of the governor of Judea to be in the hands of the Government, it is easier to account for it. It would hardly have been made solely on the current reports, unsupported by the legal report of the provincial administration. The same Tertullian goes on to say: "There was an ancient decree, that no one should be received for a deity, unless he was first approved by the Senate. Tiberius, in whose time the Christian name had its rise, having received from Palestine in Syria an account of such things as manifested the truth of his divinity, proposed to the Senate that he should be enrolled among the Roman gods, and gave his own prerogative vote in favor of the motion. But the Senate rejected it, because the Emperor himself had declined the same honor." There can be no doubt that the *Acta Pilati* were for many years in the archives of Rome, and were perpetually appealed to by the Christian apologists, to deprecate the persecuting fury of the Government. Those official re-

ports of Pilate seem to have confirmed all the leading facts touching the history and death of Jesus as narrated in the New Testament. It is also known that the Emperor Alexander Severus kept the image of Christ in the chapel of the palace, and was only restrained from raising a temple in honor of him, by the oracles, which foretold if this were done, all the rest of the temples would be forsaken.

The early infidel and pagan enemies of Christianity, Celsus, Porphyry, Hierocles, and the Emperor Julian, the Apostate, never pretended to question the miraculous facts of the Gospel history, as facts; they only denied their divine origin. Celsus openly admits the facts and ascribes them to the magic arts, which Christ learned in Egypt. Julian says: "Jesus did nothing worthy of fame unless any one can suppose that curing the lame and blind, and exorcising demons in the villages of Bethsaida, are some of the greatest works." He acknowledges that Jesus had a sovereign power over "impure spirits," that He walked on the surface of the sea, and expelled demons. He admits the facts, but endeavors to depreciate their significance and value. Strauss and Renan admit a basis of fact, but explain away all that was miraculous in them. According to the modern rationalistic commentators, the transfiguration, for example, was only the beams of the new-risen sun, falling on the eyes of the witnesses suddenly roused from sleep, and mistaken for a supernatural transformation. To all this sort of canvassing of the facts, the plain Anglo-Saxon intellect refuses to consent. The facts are true as related, or we have no reliable evidence that anything at all occurred. The testimony must either be accepted or refused. Witnesses who are deceived, or who positively lie in the cool narration of alleged occurrences, are not to be believed at all. If they are at all reliable, they are reliable in all they say.

This is an imperfect *résumé* of one single branch of the Christian evidences, the proof of the Gospel miracle. They not only establish the wondrous history of the apostolic era, but render it forever impossible for any really well-informed and judicially impartial understanding to confound them with the miracle of the Calendar. The brilliant and prolific writer who estimates that on "human evidence the miracles of St. Teresa

and St. Francis of Assisi are as well established as those of the New Testament," and that the miracles of the Roman Calendar "resemble and rival those of the Gospels," will not be able to carry the judgment of any one outside of the infidel ranks and the Roman Catholic Church, who is sufficiently informed to be credited with a competent knowledge of the case. We repeat again, the Christian Gospel stands upon facts—facts already accomplished and incapable of obliteration or change or successful obscuration—facts supported by a kind and degree and complication of evidence which support no other facts in all the history of mankind. Science may compel alteration in some interpretations of Scripture, but can never shake its foundations. The Word and Church of God rest upon a basis of past facts, which are absolutely incapable of change by any conceivable power.

CLEMENT R. VAUGHAN.

III.

MEDIÆVAL JEWISH THEOLOGY.*

ALTHOUGH published some time ago, the book named in the margin has not attracted quite the attention it deserves, and it is not too late for us to give some account of it to American readers. To begin with the external features, it is a large page octavo, printed in a distinct Latin type. The reader of German books knows how to be grateful for this feature. The author is designated simply as Dr. David Kaufmann. However little we may care for a man's titles, it would yet be pleasant to place a new author in some local habitation. From internal evidence we conclude that Dr. Kaufmann is a Jewish scholar—perhaps instructor in the Jewish Seminary at Breslau.

The title is: "History of the Doctrine of the [Divine] Attributes in the Jewish Mediæval Theology from Saadia to Maimonides." This gives the scope of the treatise. The author has chosen the doctrine of the divine attributes as forming the kernel of theology. The writers whom he treats are seven in number, viz: Saadia, Bachia Ibn Pakuda, Solomon Ibn Gabirol (Avicebron), Judah ha-Levi, Joseph Ibn Zaddik, Abraham Ibn Daud, and Maimonides. Of these names three are not unknown to the Gentile world; Saadia, Judah, and Maimonides. These three are treated at greater length than are the others—about three-quarters of the body of the work being devoted to them. Of the remainder Bachia Ibn Pakuda has the worst fate. We are only told that Dr. Kaufmann has "set forth the theology of this thinker in the Transactions of the Imperial Academy at Vienna." We are inclined to think that the Transactions of this learned body are not accessible to every one, even in Germany, and we rather regret, for the sake

* *Geschichte der Attributenlehre in der Jüdischen Religionsphilosophie des Mittelalters von Saadia bis Maimuni*, von David Kaufmann. Gotha: 1877. pp. xiv., 527.

of completeness, that our author did not reproduce his essay, or some abridgment of it, here.

The Jewish writers named above followed each other chronologically in the order given. The reason why this particular group was chosen as the subject of our treatise may be easily seen. The post-biblical Jewish literature naturally divides itself into three distinctly marked periods. We may characterize them severally as the age of the Apocrypha, of the Talmud, and of the modern Hebrew. After the destruction of Jerusalem, the mental activity of the expatriated Jews was concentrated on the Law. It became to them the object of devotion in place of the temple they had lost. The more rigorously they were excluded from the only site where sacrifice could lawfully be offered, the more zealously they turned their attention to such ritual and ceremonial as was still left to them. For centuries the whole nation labored at a common problem, and produced finally the marvelous *Corpus Juris* which we know as the Talmud. The culmination of this period we may mark at about the sixth Christian century. The Talmud was then committed to writing. Its study began to decline as soon as its form was fixed. In the Jewish as in the Christian world, there followed a period of comparative sterility. The West had fallen to the Barbarians. Byzantium, in the last stage of decrepitude, could keep up only the semblance of the old Roman power and Roman civilization.

The awakening which finally came was connected with the spread of Mohammedanism. Arabia had been till now a cipher in the world's progress. Her scattered clans had spent their strength in internal conflict. The camel-driver of Mecca was the first to make them feel their strength, for he was the first to unite them in a common cause. This is not the place to follow the course of the new and vigorous power which, in less than a century after the death of the Prophet, had robbed the Church of its fairest provinces, made Africa and Spain subject to the Caliph, and even thundered at the door of the young kingdom of the Hammerer. This history as a phenomenon, as an external thing, is known to every one. We are here concerned with less obvious features—the rise of a new learning and its influence on Judaism. The promise of a literature did not seem fair under the earlier Caliphs. Whether Omar in

fact destroyed the library at Alexandria, the saying attributed to him expresses well enough his temper and that of his immediate successors. The Koran was literature enough for them. But when the work of conquest was done, and the Commander of the Faithful gave himself to the pleasures of a court, art was called to his aid. The rigor of persecution was relaxed, and Jews and Christians basked in the imperial favor. The Jews, in fact, had always been more congenial to the Muselman than the Christians. Many Arabian tribes had professed to be Jews before the time of Mohammed. Mohammed himself was at one time inclined to embrace Judaism. His system might almost be called a Jewish heresy. In the latter part of his life he was indeed disposed to persecute, but the fact remained that he had recognized the Old Testament as a divine revelation. Many points of similarity in belief and custom were evident to every observer. We need not be surprised that in the court of Baghdad, Jewish scholars and physicians were welcome. Even Christian princes have been glad to avail themselves of similar service.

The impulse to philosophical studies among the Arabs came from the Christians. Aristotle, who was recognized by them as *the* Philosopher, was made known through the labors of Syrian monks. With philosophy came into being a rationalistic theology, and, as a reaction from this, sturdy orthodoxy and slavish traditionalism. These intellectual movements soon spread into the camp of Israel. Polemics had something to do with it. The Arabic authors maintained that the Jewish Scriptures contain prophecies of Mohammed. Attempts to proselytize seem to have been made with such arguments addressed to the Jews. It became a matter of interest to the leaders of this people to reply to such assertions, and a renewed and zealous study of the Bible was the result. During the supremacy of the Talmud such study had been comparatively neglected.* The sect of Karaim, indeed, had insisted on the study of the Bible, and maintained its authority to be superior to that of the Talmud. Their study, however, had been with little conception of a true scientific

* It is a remarkable fact that the labors of the Masorites in fixing the Old Testament text were carried on in just this period.

method. It was in the train of Arabic speculation that genuine and fruitful exegetical work was carried on. The battle of rationalism and orthodoxy that raged among the Moslems was fought over with the Hebrew Bible in place of the Koran.

The Jewish theology of this period is then a branch of Arabic theology. The terminology and method was the same in both. Nearly all the works of Jews in this period were written in Arabic. It is so of the works criticised in the treatise before us, though some of them are extant only in Hebrew translations. We have spoken of "this period," and we think our author has chosen just the men who make a distinctly marked group. Beginning with Saadia, who was unquestionably the pioneer of the movement, he breaks off with Maimonides, in whom it as unquestionably reached its culmination. After him speculation lost its vigor, and the interest centred elsewhere. Within the group two tendencies are noticeable—the rationalistic and the orthodox. It may be of interest to examine one writer on each side. Saadia, the first one in order, is a good example of the former tendency.

This philosopher, born in Fayum in Egypt (hence in Arabic his name is Sa'ad al-Fayumi), was called, while quite a young man, to be President (Gaon) of the celebrated Rabbinical school at Sura in Mesopotamia,—hence his Hebrew name, Saadia ha-Gaon. He had at that time already distinguished himself by his writings against the Karaim. The school over which he was called to preside had lost much of its importance, and its chief had hitherto been subservient to the Jewish Exilarch (Resh Galutha). Saadia was called upon to confirm an unrighteous legal decision of the Exilarch, and, on refusal, was deposed. He lived for some time in retirement at Baghdad, but was finally restored to his office, and held it till his death (A.D. 942).

Among his numerous works,* two of the most important have come down to us. One of these is the translation into Arabic of the whole Old Testament. This is undoubtedly the Arabic version contained in the Paris and London Polyglots.

* The list of these embraces grammars and lexicons of the Hebrew, commentaries on the Bible and Talmud, refutations of the Karaim, etc. Cf. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*. Bd. 5, p. 479, 59.

As the work of one man, it is perhaps unique among Jewish translations of the Scriptures.*

The other work, and the one which concerns us here, is a theologico-philosophical work, entitled "Emunoth we-Deoth" ("Dogmas and Philosophy"). It was originally written in Arabic, but soon became current in a Hebrew translation, and it is now known chiefly in this form.† The year 943 of our era is given as the date of its composition.

We may now allow Dr. Kaufmann to analyze for us the theology of Saadia. For his purpose, only the first and second chapters of the Emunoth are available; the two which treat theology proper. The first is occupied with the proof for the existence of God, and on this he remarks:

"Saadia's proof for the existence of God is what we call the cosmological. This he gives in his first chapter with detail and thoroughness. Before he can undertake to define the attributes of God, he finds it necessary to establish the *idea* of God safe from confutation or attack. Hence this introductory chapter. . . . Two objections to this method of proof seem to have been current at the time. To judge by the reply made to them they were in substance these. One says, To be sure we can argue from effect to cause, and so from the universe to its cause, but we must in this follow the analogy of experience. In every natural succession of events, we find a *physical* cause only. In seeking a first cause, therefore, we have no right to spring from a physical effect to a *super-physical* cause. The second objection denies that our mind can stop at any point in the chain of cause and effect, for the question arises anew, What is the cause of this cause? In other words, why can we not assume a *regressus in infinitum*? The first objection is treated in a passage which we will transfer hither.

"If any one answers (says Saadia), you have assumed a Creator evidently because you have never seen, in the world of sense, a thing made (*factum*) without a maker, an effect without a cause. But you have seen in the world of sense that a material object is always derived from a material object. How can you make that an evidence that every effect has a cause; why not rather that one material object must always spring from another material object?" (pp. 3-6).

We have not space to give the answer to these objections in the words of the author. It is, however, twofold. We are in-

* For the evidence that the translation contained in the Polyglots is Saadia's, cf. Ewald und Duke's "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Aeltesten Auslegung des A. T."

† The work is extant in Arabic, but in MSS. The Hebrew translation has been printed twice, and a translation from this into German was made by Fürst (Leipzig, 1845). It may be interesting to some to see the divisions of the work. They are as follows:

Introduction—On the Sources of Knowledge and the Causes of Error; Chapter I.—That the World and all it Contains is *Created*; Chapter II.—That the Creator is *One*; Chapter III.—Of Commandments and Warnings [on the necessity of a revelation]; Chapter IV.—Of Worship, of Rebellion, of Necessity, and of Righteousness [the Freedom of the Human Will]; Chapter V.—Of Merit and Guilt; Chapter VI.—Of the Nature of the Soul and of Death; Chapter VII.—Of the Resurrection; Chapter VIII.—Of the Final Redemption [the Messiah]; Chapter IX.—Of Future Reward and Punishment; Chapter X.—What it is Good for Man to Do in this World (this chapter on Ethics is not in the German translation).

quiring in regard to the origin of things. It is now a *petitio principii* to assume that every material object has arisen from another material object. This is exactly the question under discussion, whether there may not be some other cause. We must exclude this objection, for it prejudices the case. Saadia does not lay much weight upon this answer, because it is too metaphysical for his book. He therefore urges in the second place a thing of common observation, to wit: In the chain of cause and effect we may notice that each cause is less solid (less substantial) than its effect. Thus if we inquire for the cause of snow, it is water; the cause of water is an ethereal vapor; the vapor must have a still less substantial cause, and so on. It is only natural that the last member of the series should be altogether immaterial. The natural course of our *thinking* also is from the material to the immaterial. We begin with a sensible object such as the lower animals observe. But we recognize from it its accidents, its quantity, space, time, and finally the most subtle of all conceptions. The answer to the second objection, which supposes an endless series, is that such an endless series is inconceivable. If it is to be endless, the force of each member must be infinite. But this is impossible. Our understanding, moreover, is limited; it refuses to conceive of such an endless chain.

After this brief notice of the argument for the divine existence, we come to the chapter which treats of the divine attributes. This, the second chapter of the Emunoth, is headed, "That the Creator is One." It is, in reality, however, a discussion of all the attributes. Dr. Kaufmann extends his analysis over some sixty pages. We quote from the earlier portion:

"Wherever we argue from an effect to a cause, we not only show the existence of the cause, but we determine something of its nature. A philosophical contemplation of the idea of God can therefore ascribe to him only such attributes as are already in the proof for his existence. To test Saadia's logic by this rule, we have only to notice whether he does in reality ascribe to God such attributes (and such only) as are necessarily involved in the conception of that cause whose existence he has already proved, 'God—praise be to Him—has revealed to us by His prophets (these are Saadia's words) that He is *one, living, powerful, wise*; to Him and to His works nothing can be compared. Concerning this He has given us Scripture verses and evidences, so that we may readily accept what reason tells us.' In fact, it is *what reason tells us* that he gives." (p. 15).

This important passage gives in a nutshell the theology of this thinker, and its logic is evident. The inquiry concern-

ing the derivation of the universe has led us to one first cause. The chapter on creation is largely taken up with the demonstration that the first cause can be but one. This cause now has produced an effect consciously; He is able to accomplish everything in the best manner; He does so accomplish everything. This necessarily implies that He is living, mighty, and wise. That He is incomparable seems to be added to emphasize His immateriality. It would seem to be self-evident, and one is somewhat at a loss to know whether Saadia means in this passage to make a distinct attribute of incomparability. It does not elsewhere appear that he does. But from what is given above we see that the attributes recognized by him are those involved in the act of creation. They are—leaving out unity, which is really only a negative attribute—life, power, and wisdom.

The divine unity, however, as the recognized corner-stone of Judaism, takes up a large share of attention with this writer. Besides the space given to it in the preceding chapter of the *Emunoth*, it is here treated again. He feels that he has laid himself open to attack by asserting these three attributes, as if he were making concessions to the Christian Trinitarianism. After his demonstration of the divine unity, he alludes to this and protests against the idea that the attributes are in such a sense separate that they justify an accusation of this kind. The passage in which he considers this point is interesting enough to quote :

“I will now state (says he) how from the fact that God is Creator, I derive the evidence that He is living, wise, and mighty. It is to wit, clear to us that only one who is powerful can create; and only one who *lives* that is powerful; and that a well-ordered creation can come only from one who knows what it is to create. Our understanding now has reached these three attributes of the Creator at one stroke, not in succession at different stages of the investigation, since it is just in the fact of creation that we see God to be living, wise, and mighty. It is impossible that the understanding should arrive at one of these characteristics earlier than at the others; on the contrary, it must reach them all at once, for we hold it to be impossible that a non-living or a non-powerful being should be Creator, or that a perfect work could proceed from one who does not know how his plan will turn out. We are unable, however, to state these things together *in speech*, in the way in which we reach them by the reasoning process. For we find in language no expression that will embrace these three, so that we are compelled to define our idea by three words, although we have expressly declared the three attributes to be in fact united as one. Let no one think, however, that the Eternal (praise be to Him) contains within Himself different and separate qualities, for all these qualities only define the fact that He is Creator, and it is only our form of expression which compels us to define this notion in three words. We find among our words none that embraces these three in one. We are unable (further) to coin such a word. Such a new word would have to be explained by those already in existence, and so we should be in the same difficulty as before. If any one supposes now that these qualities imply a real

diversity, since one is not the same as another, I will proceed to show him his absurdity. Diversity and change are only present in corporeal things, the Creator is exalted above them. . . . I remark that exactly as the word Creator expresses not *something added to His essence*, but only the fact of His creation, so the expressions : living, wise, mighty, do not designate something added to His essence, but only the fact of His creation. They are only the carrying out of the idea Creator." (pp. 25-27).

Not content with this emphatic statement, our philosopher considers at some length the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. The form in which he has stated his doctrine bears considerable resemblance to some speculative Trinitarianism. The different sects of Mohammedans accused each other of leaning to the Christian doctrine. Sharastani, author of a history of Arabic theology, accuses one party of reproducing the doctrine of the "Nastûriya" (Nestorians). According to him these sectaries hold that God is one Being with three Persons, which are not Himself and do not add anything to His essence. These Saadia has in mind when he enters upon a refutation of the Christians. As to the common people, who conceive of God as three persons in the crudest manner, he disdains to consider their belief. He addresses himself rather to the philosophers who defend the Trinity on speculative grounds. Here we may again give his own words :

"These (the Christian philosophers) recognize the divine attributes, in that they say : there can be only one living wise Creator. But in holding fast the attributes, they affirm life and wisdom to be two things separate from the divine essence ; so, taking these together [essence, life, wisdom], they have a triad. Now for the refutation. It is evident they must conceive of God as corporeal or incorporeal. If the first, they fall into the error of the common people, who assign to God a material body. If, however, they conceive of Him as incorporeal, they are yet inconsistent in predicating of Him diversity, for only material things have the quality of number. We have shown, in regard to our three attributes, that they are in reality only one—though they cannot be expressed by a single word. We do, in fact, grasp them mentally as one. It is precisely as if one should say : 'I do not worship fire, but a burning, flaming, upward-tending substance.' But this is exactly fire. . . . We, the communion of monotheists, believe that a *man's* life is something different from himself. Because we see him at one time alive, afterwards dead, we know there is in him something whereby he lives, the withdrawal of which causes his death. So we perceive that a man is at one time wise, at another ignorant, and we conclude there is something whereby he is wise, which being withdrawn he is ignorant. If we had not observed these facts, we should have concluded man to be wise and living in his essence. It is now impossible to suppose a time when the Creator was not living, not wise. We are compelled to conclude that wisdom and life belong to His essence, and that the teaching of these men is false." (pp. 38-40).

Besides this speculative refutation, Saadia brings other arguments to bear. All of them seem directed against the same form of Trinitarianism. Did the doctrine of the Nestorian Church ever take this form? If so, we may approve the next

argument against it. It is in substance this: you obtain there persons by personifying [hypostasizing] these three attributes. But you must recognize other attributes—*power*, for one, at any rate. Why not carry on the personification through the list? We have no space to dwell on this point, nor on the criticism of the Scripture (Old Testament of course) argument for the Trinity. Saadia mentions a number of passages in which the Spirit and Word of God are spoken of; as, for example, 2 Sam. xxiii. 2, "The Spirit of God spake by me, and his word was in my tongue." Here he understands by Spirit and Word, *created things* which God had laid in the mouth of the prophet. So the verse Ps. xxiv. 4, "That hath not lifted up *my soul* (according to the Qeri) to vanity." Here the soul (nephesh) of God cannot be anything different from the "Spirit" of the other passage, *i. e.*, God's revelation of Himself. Again the well-known verse, Prov. viii. 22, "Jehovah [possessed] me in the beginning of his way." He first argues that the verb means *created*, and adds: the Scripture does not mean that Wisdom was first created as a medium through which all else was afterwards created, but simply that God made all things *with wisdom*, wisely, so that every one can see in the creation the wise Creator. Further discussion of Christian doctrine follows, with some allusion to the various theories touching the person of Christ.

We have traced this system to its climax. Starting with the universe it has found God; it has predicated of Him life, wisdom, and power; it has defended His unity against the attacks of unbelievers. One question more must be answered. The number of the divine attributes here conceded is surprisingly small in comparison with the vast number with which the pious soul delights to exalt God—surprisingly small even by the side of the varied assertions of Scripture. Is it not possible to find other attributes for the Creator? To this question Saadia answers decidedly—no. According to him we cannot in reason predicate anything of God except these. All other assertions of Scripture are anthropomorphic. To show this, he examines the assertions of Scripture. Taking the ten categories of Aristotle in order, he shows that nothing under any of them could properly be predicated of God. The rules which guide him in this process are given in the following passage:

"Having spoken of these other matters, I will now examine those attributes (and the questions arising in connection with them) which we find given in Scripture, or which we notice in the expressions of believers. I will make one general remark by way of preface. No substance and no accident and no attribute of substance or accident can be predicated of the Creator. . . . It is certainly true of this Creator (praised and exalted may He be) that He brought forth all, so that there is neither substance nor accident nor anything whatever that can be attributed to Him. . . . When now in the books of the prophets such attributes are given Him it is only because other terms—such as meet the requirements of reason—are not to be found in human speech. Whatever of this nature we, the communion of Monotheists, predicate of God is therefore to be taken figuratively, as an approximation, not in the gross materialistic sense. Having prefaced these remarks, kind reader, let it not trouble you if you yourself use of Him such expressions as living, willing, pleased, displeased, and such like, or if you find them in Scripture."

This passage will justify us in putting Saadia at the head of the rationalistic party. His three positions are: (1), that we can predicate nothing of the Divine Essence, because God is maker of all; (2), that the Scripture expressions are insufficient to convey a knowledge of His real attributes; (3), that language, in this case, and in the popular expressions concerning God, is altogether figurative. Even the three attributes with which he started are now explained to be attributes of the divine activity rather than the divine essence. Like our modern philosophers, however, although he has reduced the content of the idea of God so as to leave little of it, he is yet willing to concede much to "the religious feeling." The closing paragraph of this chapter gives an example of this. To the one who is really illuminated as to the divine nature, he allows the use of any and all predicates in which the pious soul may find satisfaction. The paragraph itself contains a large number of such attributes taken mostly from the Old Testament. Only he does not allow this to be carried too far. He treats the question, for example, whether the divine omnipotence is sufficient to make five equal to ten, or to pass the earth through a finger-ring without enlarging the one or reducing the other. God can do all things, he says, but these things are absurdities, and therefore *nothing*. In this point we may agree with Dr. Kaufmann that Saadia has "approached the most enlightened views of ancient and modern Dogmatics concerning the divine omnipotence."

A recent writer* has exalted the theology we have been sketching as the dawn of modern thought. This seems, to say

* "The God of Israel: a History," in the *Nineteenth Century*, for September, 1879; reprinted in the *Hebrew Review*, April, 1881.

the least, an exaggerated statement. In the general movement of the Arabian mind, which was the forerunner of Scholasticism rather than of the Renaissance, the Jews had an honorable part. Saadia was the pioneer in introducing the movement among his coreligionists. His book seems the first clear and systematic treatise on theology that came from the Synagogue. The writer, of whom we speak in tracing the history of theology, makes every new departure the result of grafting Jewish ideas upon Gentile modes of thought—"cross fertilization," whatever that may mean in the sphere of metaphysics. The facts seem hardly to bear out this theory. Saadia, albeit a pioneer to his own people, was yet largely a follower rather than a leader in the general stream of Arabic speculation. One thing we may concede: if the pantheism of Spinoza is the culmination of theology, then Saadia ha-Gaon was the morning star of its dawn. It would, perhaps, be pertinent to inquire if Spinoza himself was not a disciple in his school? Certain it is that the rationalizing tendency we have noticed in Saadia had a strong influence on his successors. Among these we find nearly all, including the great Maimonides, adopting or bettering his instructions. Dr. Kaufmann gives us an abundance of examples, and we cannot forbear alluding to some of them. Taking the next one in order after Saadia—Solomon Ibn Gabirol, known to the Scholastic writers under the name Avicbron—we find the following, which reminds us of his master:

"The first substance is Cause. . . . The true nature of substance is unknowable, although we may recognize its presence by its effects. The reason why we cannot know its nature is, that it is unconditioned and exalted above all things." (p. 96).

God is unknowable, therefore; an anticipation of recent assertions. A similar anticipation is where the same writer identifies God with Will:

"Since we know God only by His working in the world, we recognize Him most easily as a formative principle. God, as acting in the world in distinction from the divine Essence, is what Gabirol calls *Will*. The will is thus not God himself as He is, but God as He appears to us—God in the relation of His activity, as one has defined the Logos of Plato." (p. 99).

We shall not wonder to find Gabirol denying the reality of any attributes of God, and speaking of creation as an emanation (p. 104). Similarly, Joseph Ibn Zaddik declares God to

be unknowable.* The only question we can ask concerning Him is, whether He *is*. The answer must be in the affirmative, arguing from the existence of the universe. This must have had a Creator—the same argument that we have seen stated by Saadia. Like him also Ibn Zaddik emphasizes the divine unity, and seems to make an attribute of incomparability. Other attributes are ostensibly conceded by him, but all reduced at last to unity, and even this is defined as a negative attribute. This thinker, in fact, prefers the negative form in any case as the more correct. “To avoid misunderstanding, the philosopher pronounces it better to put what he says concerning God in the negative form. It is better, for example, to say God is not foolish, than to say He is wise” (p. 330). Very similar assertions are found in the *Emunah Ramah* of Abraham Ibn Daud.

It is time for us to turn to the other tendency visible in Jewish as in Arabic theology. Its only representative in the book before us is Judah [Jehudah] ha-Levi, known as the greatest poet of his race since the destruction of Jerusalem. He was a native of Spain, and was early brought into contact with both Mohammedanism and Christianity. His treatise on theology† was written in Arabic, but, like so many others, is better known in the Hebrew translation. In form this book is a dialogue between an inquirer and representatives of the three great religions. Its first step is to show the insufficiency of philosophy. The inquirer goes to a philosopher, but the philosopher assures him that God must be so exalted above the world and its inhabitants that He has no need of their service, and could not condescend to interfere in their affairs. Moreover, the man who by the study of philosophy has reached the higher plane of living, has no need of religious faith. The inquirer is naturally dissatisfied with this, and turns to the Christian priest and the Mohammedan ulema. As both of these make the Hebrew religion the basis of their own, he finally seeks a Jew and learns of him. The Jew, in-

* His argument is peculiar. To know a thing, he says, we must know its cause. God, however, is uncaused, and therefore unknowable. Cf. Kaufmann, p. 276, *sq.*

† Entitled *Kusari*, according to his latest editor, Cassel. Grätz transcribes it *Chosari*. The old method made it *Cosri*. Cf. the translation, *Liber Cosri*, etc. Basileæ, MDCLX.

stead of beginning as the others had begun with a statement of the necessity of a Creator, begins by asserting the fact of a revelation. This is his ground for believing in the existence of God—God had actually declared Himself in the history of the Jewish nation.

This shows the breach between philosophy and theology. Philosophy reasons *a priori*, or at the most from the fact of creation; theology takes her stand on history. In examining the contents of Revelation, many questions must arise touching the attributes there ascribed to God. How are we to understand these? Judah examines the whole Old Testament, and is compelled, like the philosophers, to concede that the attributes do not give us a knowledge of the divine essence. He divides them into three classes—attributes of action, of negation, and of relation. Among the negative attributes he classes unity, life, wisdom, and many others. When we say God is one, we do not mean to assert that the quality of number belongs to Him; His unity must be different from the unity of any created thing. All we mean to assert is, that there are not more Gods than one. So when we say God is wise, we might say just as truly He is not wise; for neither wisdom nor foolishness are His in the sense in which a man is wise or foolish. Now, to guard against the supposition that He is foolish, we say He is wise. The attributes of action are those which express the effects, of which we believe God to be the cause. These are infinite in number, according to the operations seen in nature. Examples are: making poor, making rich, raising up, bringing down, merciful and pitiful, jealous and mighty. Some of these might be classed as relative attributes, in so far as they have relation to us. The *class* of relative attributes, however, is limited, so as to include those expressions “in which the reverence of man expresses his relation to God” (Kaufmann, p. 142). Examples are: worthy of praise, exalted, holy. These also do not define the divine essence, but express only the feelings of the creature.

The names of God in the Scriptures express some of His attributes, but with the limitations given above. Such names as the Almighty, the Merciful, are, in fact, active attributes. Other names, which do not seem to belong with these, are yet similar to them. “The name Elohim is the expression of a

conviction (awakened by our consideration of God's all-embracing power over the natural world) that He must be ruler. The name is used of any ruler, even in a limited sphere; as, for example, of a human judge." As the number of such rulers is great, the plural form of the name is accounted for. Men used it at first to designate the collective powers of the universe; but as these powers are all derived from God, the name was afterwards applied to Him (p. 159, *sq.*) In this, as in his treatment of the attributes proper, we might justly accuse our author of falling into the arms of the philosophy which he has just rejected with scorn. There remains one name of God, however, which is peculiar to the Hebrew revelation. Beginning from this name, he endeavors to build up a system which shall surpass that of the philosophers. These are his words:

"The true and accurate designation and highest perfection lies in the name יהוה; for this is a proper name. . . . One may ask, who is the *Elohim* that is to be worshipped—the sun, the moon, the heavens, the Zodiac, or some other? for each of these has power [and therefore may be called *Elohim*]. The true answer is Jehovah* [which belongs to Him alone]. It is exactly as when one calls a man Reuben or Simeon—his real essence is thus brought to our knowledge." (p. 169, *sq.*)

As proof that this is a proper name, is adduced the fact that it never appears with the article; while *Elohim*, of course, does so appear. This name—the proper name of God—was revealed to Israel alone. As to its derivation, our author holds that it has no human etymology. He sees a mysterious significance in the fact that it is made up of vowel letters alone—the vowels which are "the souls for the consonantal bodies." He believes this name to have been revealed to Adam and to the Patriarchs.

The unpronounceable name was revealed to Moses and the Israelites in connection with the miracles on Mount Sinai. Before this time men had believed in the God of creation; but now, when they saw miracles performed for the sake of Israel, there dawned upon them the idea of a Preserver and of a Providence, as well as a Creator. The knowledge of the true divine name was continued in Israel, and Israel became the

* We retain the English form of this name. In consistency with his view of its origin, Judah ha-Levi seems to hold that it is *necessarily* unpronounceable; and he gives reasons why Adonai was chosen as the substitute for it in reading the Scriptures.

clearest testimony to the true idea corresponding to this name. Not that the name was first revealed to Moses; the Patriarchs also had known it. The passage that seems to contradict this (Ex. vi. 3) only means that they did not see the miracles which accompanied the later revelation. They did not need the miracles, for their faith was strong without them.

This name has its attributes. As we may in some sense call the act of creation an attribute of Elohim, so the miracles performed before the eyes of the Israelites were attributes of Jehovah. Hence these are in the Scripture brought into direct connection with this name. They are meant under the phrases, *Glory of Jehovah, Angels of Jehovah, and Shekinah*. For example, the Angels (messengers) of Jehovah were the miraculous pillar of cloud, the fire on Sinai. These were directly created by him as a means of revealing His word. The beings that appeared to the prophets when they "saw Jehovah" were such angels—either created for the moment to authenticate the revelation, or belonging to the ordinary court of heaven, but usually invisible. The men who see these phenomena have a knowledge of God more certain than philosophy can give. Not that any one can see God himself. The process of reasoning from these phenomena is the same that is used in regard to the material world. When we say we see a king, we do not in truth see the king, but a shape and a combination of colors. These change, moreover; in the camp they are different from what they are in the palace, yet we recognize the king in both. The appearance of the king when dead may be the same as when he was alive, yet we do not then call him the king. Our knowledge of the king rests upon a conclusion of the understanding. Or take the sun as another example (seemingly a favorite comparison with our author). We do not need to look at the sun to know that it gives light. We see the light reflected on objects about us, and conclude there is a source for it. If the sun were always behind the clouds, we could yet know there was such a thing and know something about it. The visions of the prophets give them such a knowledge of God. They have an inner sense, from whose data they can draw just such conclusions concerning God as we ordinary men draw concerning material objects from the observations of the bodily eye. And as in respect to outward objects the general agreement of

mankind is evidence for the truth—as, for example, that the sun is a round disk or ball—so the agreement of the prophets is an evidence for the truth of what they have seen. “As in the world of sense there is an agreement concerning the objects of sense-perception, so there is an agreement among the prophets concerning supersensible perceptions. As the understanding takes care not to regard the pictures of sense as the substance of the things perceived, in like manner the understanding of the prophets regards the pictures of the inner sense as pictures only, which have indeed a reality for the sense, but which do not present the substance of the One revealed. Finally, as our judgment pronounces sense-perceptions to reveal the *accidents* of bodies only, in like manner their judgment ascribes to the perceptions of the inner sense, only the value of means to the attainment of the truth” (p. 208).

This is perhaps enough for the system of Judah ha-Levi. Its distinctive characteristic is this elevation of prophecy above philosophy, with the implication that the prophet's knowledge of God is as much above the philosopher's, as the spiritual perception by which the prophet sees visions, is above the natural eye. The prophet has in some sense a direct perception of God—as direct as the perception of the creature can be. One point seems to have been ignored. The question must arise, can the prophets communicate this knowledge of God, or is it valid for them alone? The natural answer would seem to be that they could tell us of the fact of their perception, as a man with perfect eyesight might testify to the existence of a sense not possessed by one born blind, although he could by no stretch of descriptive powers give the blind man a correct idea of light or color. The question seems, however, to have escaped our author, though he makes such frequent use of the sense of sight as a means of comparison. Thus he speaks of the philosophers as comparable to weak-eyed or cross-eyed persons, the prophets to the clear-sighted:

“So stands revealed to the eye of the prophet a world of wonderful manifestations, in which the criteria of ordinary thought are not applicable. Where the human understanding must be content with imperfect conceptions and a laborious logic, there the inner sense reaches the immediate intuition of the truth. Philosophy, therefore, can attain only a shadowy idea of God, whom she is able to characterize in the most general terms, while prophecy is in a position to give a living representation of him, and to name him by his own incommunicable name. The results of these two kinds of knowledge of God must be as different as their sources. It is not given to all men to

know God in the same manner; the attitude of the soul toward this light is not in all cases the same. The case is parallel with that of sunlight—this is always the same, yet differs in appearance, according to the objects which receive its influence. Some of these, like the crystal, the air, the limpid water, show the completest receptivity for it; but whatever the object it illuminates, men speak of the light as *light*. The universal knowledge of God expressed in the name Elohim may be compared with light in general; the light which passes into and through transparent substances is that which is expressed in the name Jehovah. This name designates the relation between God and the most perfect of His creatures, the prophets whose souls were transparent, susceptible to his light, which penetrates them as the light of the sun penetrates the rock crystal and jacinth" (p. 223, *sq.*)

In accordance with this the author holds that the prophetic knowledge of God has an effect upon the affections and the life that is not wrought by philosophy. As personal intercourse with a good man arouses an affection for him which would never have been stirred by a description of his virtues, so the prophets had a love and a longing for God to which the philosophers were strangers. This love was a motive to Abraham when he left his home, and when he obeyed the command to sacrifice Isaac. Aristotle, on the other hand, who knew God by the way of speculation only, was only led to despise all religious service, and to doubt whether God could have any knowledge of the devotion of His worshippers.

The question will naturally arise, how much of this theology is original with the author. In this case, as in the other, the answer must be that the Jew followed in the wake of the Moslem. The extreme of rationalistic speculation was succeeded by a reaction. The celebrated Gazzali led in the protest against the subservience of theology to philosophy. Kaufmann examines the work of Gazzali, and shows decisively that in all essential points Judah was his disciple. Even his views of prophecy are in substance the same. Of course the argument drawn from the divine name Jehovah, originated with the Israelite. His merit aside from this is the adaptation of Gazzali's views to the Old Testament revelation. In turn Judah was influential in the philosophy of his own race, and it seems likely that the extravagancies of the Kabala were the final outcome of the doctrines set forth in the book Kusari. Tendencies toward mysticism are not wanting in the book itself. The use of the book Jezirah is a case in point.

The tendency of the day is to investigate and chronicle every phase of human thought; to examine and classify systems of

philosophy hitherto unknown or despised. Comparative study is everywhere assuming a prominent part. The book we have been examining is an important contribution to the history of human thought—to the comparative study of theology if one will. On the whole we are constrained to say that the author has done his work well. The writers whom he has chosen as his theme are inaccessible to the vast majority of Christian scholars. They have suffered from the prejudices of the Gentile world as well as from its ignorance. If on mature examination we cannot concede all that has been said by their admirers, we may yet give them an honorable place in the history of human thought. We are indebted to their critic for making us acquainted with a hitherto imperfectly known movement.

We ought to mention in conclusion the numerous notes comparing the Hebrew and Arabic texts of the works quoted, discussing technical terms in both these languages, and correcting the language of earlier translators or commentators. The tone of the author throughout is almost entirely "objective." So far as we are able to judge he has not allowed his own views to appear at all. The work is provided with three indexes, one general, one of Arabic, and one of Hebrew words discussed or explained. We have noticed a few typographical errors aside from those noted in the list of errata.

HENRY P. SMITH.

IV.

THE BIBLICAL BLANK.

JOSEPHUS says that the Jaddua mentioned, by Nehemiah (xii. 11), in the list of High Priests after the return from the Babylonish captivity, was the one who met Alexander the Great on his approach to Jerusalem. If that be so, the "Darius the Persian" (of v. 22) is Darius Codomannus, whom Alexander conquered; the Old Testament history comes down to 323 B.C.; an addition was made to the Book of Nehemiah after the death of Nehemiah; and the Canon of the Old Testament was not closed until nearly one hundred years after Malachi.

The Rationalistic school of interpreters contend that the Book of Daniel and some of the Psalms belong to the Macabean period.

But even though both these positions were conceded, the historical references which they involve are so meagre that we should be justified in adhering to the popular statement that the four hundred years between Malachi and Christ are a blank in the sacred volume. The voice and the pen of prophecy were totally silent and inactive; and the closing paragraph of Malachi makes on the thoughtful reader the impression that it was designed to close the volume of the Old Covenant: while Mark, opening his book with the public ministry of Jesus, connects the Gospel with those closing words of the Prophet.

The period was perhaps the most seething, brilliant, and far-reaching in the history of the world. The death of Socrates and the retreat of the ten thousand, which Xenophon has immortalized, were coeval with Malachi: a statement which reminds us that the great Persian empire, after having reached the climax of its power, was entering upon its death

throes. Then came the flashing meteor course of Alexander the Great; and following that, the literary Grecian Government of the Egyptian Ptolemies and the more licentious Greek power of the Syrian Seleucidæ, which by reaction led to the Maccabean movement among the Jews, in connection with which Rome first appears with its influence upon the Jewish nation. Within ten years after the Old Testament closed, Rome was taken by the Gauls; and from that time forward the government of the seven-hilled city developed into its mighty and world-wide empire. Thus Persia declined and was overthrown; Alexander rose and died; his successors divided the Eastern world among them and held it for two hundred and fifty years, when Rome crushed them all and became the universal mistress.

The age was the golden one of Greek and Roman literature. Homer was indeed far back in the hazy past; and Herodotus had travelled, written, and died in the century which closed the Jewish Canon; but Thucydides was still living and writing. Then we have on the bright literary roll of Greece, between Malachi and Christ, Xenophon, Demosthenes, Æschines, Anaxagoras, Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus, Democritus, Hippocrates, Æschylus, Aristophanes, Menander. Latin literature had not been born when Malachi wrote; and nearly the whole of that literature which has maintained its place appeared before Christ: so rapid was the life of that element of the world's training.

Moreover, with all the great world powers the Jews came in contact. When the Old Testament closed, they were under a province of the still great Persian empire. Alexander subdued them, and was peculiarly favorable to them. They passed in succession under the government of the Egyptian Ptolemies and the Syrian Seleucidæ. Driven at last into rebellion against the latter they became again a power in the earth; and Simon, the son of Mattathias, B.C. 142, "established on the throne the only dynasty that has reigned over the undivided Jewish people, except the house of David" (Stanley's "History of the Jewish Church," iii. 408). Then, Rome, in its resistless progress, threw its dominion over them, and was in possession of their country when Jesus was born.

Some parts of this historic space are of a very thrilling

character. The condition of the Jews, down to the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, B.C. 175, was one of quietness, intellectual cultivation, and social improvement; though their land continued to be the battle-field of the empires, and especially of the mutually opposing successors of Alexander. But the Maccabean period has, in heroism, nothing to exceed it even in the inspired records. Judas Maccabeus, the *Cœur de Lion* of Hebrew history, was one of those warriors who carry the imagination captive. The account of the fearful persecution which commenced under Antiochus Epiphanes, whose object was to Hellenize the Jewish religion—the first religious persecution in the world of which we have a full narrative, and which in its particulars makes us think of the treatment of the Scotch Covenanters—fills us with admiration for the constancy of those who were thrilled by the call to arms from Mattathias. The martyrology of the Books of Maccabees, especially that of Eliezer and of the mother and her seven children, high-flown as is the account in the Fourth Book of Maccabees, is soul-inspiring. Then the first Herod, with all his cruelty, was one of the great and magnificent of the world's monarchs; under Rome, indeed, but perhaps harboring in his mind, as his eventual object, a new and mighty Eastern empire against Rome.

Nor is the Jewish literature of the period weak and insignificant. The Apocrypha, in matter almost equal to the New Testament, should not be permitted to remain in the obscurity with which they have become covered as the natural protest against the effort to canonize them. The devout student finds them destitute of a flavor, the absence of which shows that infallible inspiration did not guide their writers. But as uninspired compositions, these books are marvellous. Add to these the Book of Enoch, from which Jude quotes; which is a work of high imagination, though crude and unregulated in scientific references; which was written probably in the beginning of Herod's reign; which makes important disclosures of Jewish opinions in the generation immediately preceding Jesus; and which is "a curious attempt to reduce the scattered images of the Old Testament to a physical system," repeating "in every form the great principle that the world, natural, moral, and spiritual, is under the immediate government of God": still further, embrace the Mishna, the first portion of the Talmud;

and the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, which was really the Bible of Christ, of the Apostles, and of the early Christian Church : then observe that the Second Book of Maccabees is only an abridgment of the five books of one Jason of Cyrene, which have been lost, suggesting that a similar fate has befallen many literary ventures of the age : * consider, moreover, that such writers as Philo and Josephus, though living after the birth of Jesus, were fruits of the intellectual culture of the age preceding : and we must immediately conclude that that age was one of very great activity and power. Indeed its contact and struggle with the Greek mind would not permit it to be otherwise.

Now a clear understanding of all these facts and influences, and of the political and social life of the Holy Land when Jesus appeared, is essential to a proper interpretation of the New Testament ; and yet we are left to uninspired sources for all our information in reference to them. Let well-established facts throw some light on the reason for this.

The students of the science of Language and of the science of Religion have, in their comparative examinations, exhibited crudities not a few. Some of their inferences are on a par with the one stated by Squier in his "Aboriginal Monuments," of certain "explorers who, finding an extensive cemetery where the Aborigines had buried all their children apart from the adults, concluded they had discovered the remains of an ancient race of pigmies." But the real results reached and suggested by these studies are exceedingly valuable.

They have established the fact not only that man has a native religious faculty, but that religion was originally monotheistic. The Semitic, the Aryan, the Turanian races, before dividing into their subordinate streams, worshipped one God ; and, at first, worship which appeared to be paid to the heavens was really to the Being who was conceived to be there.

It is on this point, by the way, incidentally interesting to note the clearness with which such a writer as Gladstone, without the bias of the professional theologian, recognizes monotheism

* Nicolaus, the Rhetorician of Damascus, the intimate friend of Augustus and of the first Herod, and the advocate of Archelaus before the Emperor, wrote a drama based on the "History of Susannah," a Commentary on the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle, several geographical books, and a "History of the World," in 144 volumes.

as underlying the Grecian mythology. In his "Homer" he emphasizes, as found in the Iliad and Odyssey, "a primitive basis of monotheism, and ideas in connection with it, which seem to defy explanation, except when we compare them with the most ancient of the Hebrew traditions." Zeus, "in his character as a god exhibits the profound moral attributes of an original monotheism." In him "we have a factor representing the supreme theistic element of all the religions which contributed to make up the Olympian system; and as the Zeus of the Helioi, he appears to be in a particular degree a representative of an old monotheism which merges into supremacy in a polytheistic system." He was "heir-general to the fragments and relics of the old monotheistic traditions." In the prayer of Achilles "there is in truth a noteworthy absence of what may be termed pagan elements, and a marked exhibition of the idea of supreme and governing godhead" ("Homer," pp. 65, 66, 92, 104, 68).

But, in the clear historic age of Abraham, polytheism and idolatry had become widely established and were growing. Abraham and his descendants were therefore separated and isolated for the preservation of the true religion, and as the line through which the divinely appointed Redeemer was to appear.

The other nations of the world were not, however, totally abandoned by God. The truths of the original religion remained in their possession, though the tendency was to the perversion, degradation, and loss of those truths. But divine checks were placed in the way of that tendency, though they were not largely effectual in resisting it. Nor was salvation withdrawn from the heathen world. Its religion originally had enough of truth in it to save; and we may not doubt that a saving influence was always exercised through it, so that while, on the one hand, those who saw not the eternal power and godhead, through the works of creation and the teachings in the mind and heart, were without excuse and were condemned by the law written in their very being; yet, on the other hand, God always accepted in every nation those who feared Him and worked righteousness.

"Men were not all cast off from the beginning, except a particular family, and left to grope their way to as much truth as they could find; but, on the contrary, were all

alike put on the footing of the same revelation. . . . We feel constrained to believe that God may have had His people among every branch of mankind ; and that, even when much corruption had contaminated the truth, there may still have been some who saw in the forms of worship their spiritual meaning, and received its message in their hearts." (*Princeton Review*, xxxvii. 348, 9).

Moreover, with the instances of Job, the visions granted to Pharaoh in the time of Joseph, Balaam, Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus, Darius, Alexander the Great, and the Magi at the birth of Jesus, we cannot deny that supernatural revelations were granted to other than the Jews.*

"It has long been a matter of discussion," says Ellicott in his "Life of Christ," p. 78, n. 2, "what precisely led these Magi to expect a birth so prefigured. Was it due to a carefully preserved knowledge of the prophecy of Balaam, an opinion maintained by Origen and the majority of the ancient expositors ; or was it due to prophecies uttered in their own country, dimly foreshadowing this divine mystery? Perhaps the latter view is the more probable, especially if we associate with it a belief, which the sacred narrative gives us every reason for entertaining, that these faithful men received a special illumination both to apply rightly what they had remembered, and to recognize its verification in the phenomenon of which they were now the privileged observers."

It is worth noting on this point that as far back as the Apocryphal *Gospel of the Infancy of Jesus* it was intimated (iii. 1) that the Magi came from the East in their search for the Messiah, "according to the prophecy of Zoradascht," or Zoroaster.

The early philosophic champions of Christianity maintained that the divine influence was given in some degree to the good men of heathenism. This view, held by the Greek Fathers who had been trained up in Platonism, condensed in the declaration of Clement of Alexandria, that that philosophy was "a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ," and emblazoned on the porticoes of Eastern churches where Pythagoras and Plato are pictured among those who prepared the way for Christianity, was repelled by the Latin Fathers. *The Apostolical Constitutions* (in Ch. vi. of Book 1, belonging probably to the second century) expostulate thus:

"Abstain from all heathen books. For what hast thou to do with such foreign discourses, or laws, or false prophets, which subvert the faith of the unstable? For what

* The way in which Canon Farrar, in his "Life and Work of St. Paul," i. 631, refers to this (as Paul's "liberal and enlightened view that God had revealed Himself even to the heathen, to a degree sufficient for their happiness and their salvation had they chosen to make use of the light they had") is somewhat singular, and makes an erroneous two-fold and inconsistent impression.

defect dost thou find in the law of God, that thou shouldst have recourse to these heathenish fables ?”

But Augustine both uses them and guards against an abuse which might be made in the putting of the Jewish and Christian Revelations on a level with them :

“Some of them made great discoveries, so far as they received help from heaven, while they erred so far as they were hindered by human frailty ” (De Civ. 2 : 7).

And in his “Confessions” (7 : 20), after saying that he had first read “those books of the Platonists, and thence been taught to search for incorporeal truth,” he adds :

“Upon these I believe, Thou therefore willedst that I should fall, before I studied Thy Scriptures, that it might be imprinted on my memory how I was affected by them ; and that afterwards, when my spirits were tamed through Thy books, and my wounds touched by Thy healing fingers, I might discern and distinguish between presumption and confession ; between those who saw whither they were to go, yet saw not the way—a way that leadeth not merely to behold the beatific country, but to dwell in it. For, had I first been formed in Thy Holy Scriptures, and hadst thus in the familiar use of them grown sweet unto me, and had I then fallen upon those other volumes, they might perhaps have withdrawn me from the solid ground of piety ; or, had I continued in that healthful frame which I had thence imbibed, I might have thought that it might have been obtained by the study of the Platonic books alone ” (Prof. Shedd’s Edition, pp. 172-3).

There was thus a two-fold preparation for Christ carried on by God ; the special one among the Jews and a co-ordinate, though less pure, one among the other nations of the world.

Now the fact has been emphasized, as of important providential significance, that the Jewish people were brought in contact with the mighty empires of the world at the time of their greatest influence. The land of Judea was the highway and battle-field on which those forces met in conflict with each other. By them, as they reached their zenith, the Jews were subdued. Among them all the ancient people of Jehovah planted seed of truth, and from them, we need not hesitate to admit, received retroactive influences.

Rationalists have assumed that doctrines which are common to the Bible and to the sacred books of the heathen religions were drawn by the Jews from their neighbors ; though students of the freer school of Comparative Religion would trace them all to the workings of the one human religious consciousness. Dean Stanley asserts over and over again that immortality was a Grecian seed, first sown by Socrates and then planted in Jewish soil. Among other recent writers, Mr. W. R. Gleg (in “a

Modern Symposium on 'The Soul and Future Life,' in *The Nineteenth Century* for October, 1877), sweepingly asserts: "With the Jews, moreover, as is well known, the belief was not indigenous, but imported, and by no means an early importation." And Mallock, after having stated ("Is Life Worth Living?" p. 16) that the Positivists, in support of their position that the destruction of a belief in personal immortality would not cut the nerve of activity and morality in this life, points to the Jews "as having felt pre-eminently the dignity of this life, and having yet been absolutely without any belief in another"; and admits (p. 27) that "the doctrine of a future life was first learnt by the Jews," not from Soerates, but "from their masters during the Captivity." Matthew Arnold, it seems, has discovered also that the Jews did not even believe in God! But the self-inconsistencies, the mutual contradictions, and the historical denials which such writers exhibit are very eye-opening. Herodotus (2:123) is explicit in his declaration that "the Egyptians held that the soul of man is immortal." In a note on this in Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, Sir Gardner Wilkinson remarks:

"Cicero says the immortality of the soul was first taught by Pherecydes of Syros, the preceptor of Pythagoras, which was chiefly followed out by his disciples; but this could only allude to its introduction into Greece, since it had been the universal belief in Egypt at least as early as the third and fourth dynasty, more than 1,500 years before."

Mallock, in a sentence immediately preceeding the one which we have quoted from p. 27, declares: "The oldest civilization of which any record is left to us—the civilization of Egypt—was based on a theism which, of all other theisms, most nearly approaches ours." Now if, as has been charged in other connections and for other purposes, the Jews under Moses copied so largely from their oppressors, is it likely that they left Egypt without the far-reaching belief in immortality, even if Jacob and his family did not take it down thither?

But we may allow that in the providence and grace of God, the Jews, while carrying to other peoples the peculiarly saving truths which they had received, might in return have some of those truths clarified in their own apprehension by the contact with others, and might derive subordinate views and forms of expression from them. As far back as the second century be-

fore Christ, Aristobulus, a Jew of Alexandria, "found the Hebrew Religion in the Greek philosophy," and the "Greek philosophy in the Hebrew Scriptures," alleging that "the sages and poets of Grecian antiquity had but plagiarized their best parts from Moses, or Solomon, or Jeremiah," and even that the mythological Orpheus had met Moses in Egypt. Augustine held the belief that the idea of creation expressed in the "Timæus" was derived by Plato from Genesis. The idea of such an influence is now almost ridiculed in some quarters; and probably it has in the past been pushed further than the facts warranted; but undoubtedly there was freedom of intercourse enough among ancient nations for the attainments of each to leaven the others, and the Jews were in a position to exercise a religious influence.

The fact that the inspired history and prophecy among the Jews continued from Moses to Malachi, and then abruptly ceased, suggests that the development of spiritual truth in their line had been carried as far as it could be done. They had given to, and received from, the other Semitic nations all that God had designed; and all the preparatory revelations for the coming of the Redeemer which they could receive had been given. When there had been breaks in the history of preceding stages, the thread was on the resumption of the history thrown back over the chasm, and the earlier and the newer were connected; but when the New Testament opened there was no similar gathering up of the events of the four hundred years. As the leading results of that divinely inspired and guided development, Monotheism had been placed upon an impregnable basis. The most striking thing in the history of the Jews is that idolatry, to which they had been perpetually tempted from the days of Moses to their captivity, was never fallen into by them afterward. Their contact with Zoroastrism may have had something to do with purifying them from that evil. The inflexibility of the moral law, which had been specially committed to them, had also been established by the sweep of prophetic teaching and by their chastisement in captivity. It need not be denied that the early literatures of Egypt, of India, and of Persia, contain a morality in many respects equal to that of the Old Testament; and that even many of the precepts which Christ uttered and bound together

seem to be heard in other religions; but it is only in the Bible that they approach completeness and system, and are surrounded with the sanctions which therein enforce them. Moreover,

"the doctrines of creation and providence, of an infinite divine person and of a responsible human will, which elsewhere form the ultimate limits of speculation, had been in the Old Testament assumed at the outset. . . . The call of Abraham had set forth at once the central lesson of faith in the unseen, on which all others were raised. In the history of his family the sovereignty of God was placed in clear light; in the time of Moses he revealed himself in the wider relations of lawgiver and judge. The captivity restored the chosen people to their connection with other nations. The personal relations of God to the individual, the family, the nation, mankind, were then established in ineffaceable history."

As bearing on this, it should be remembered that, after the return from the Babylonish captivity, the High Priest had not the oracular Urim and Thummim; that the Ark of God, the Tables of Stone, the Vase of Manna, the Rod of Aaron had been lost; and that the Holy of Holies was empty. Pompey the Great had the temerity, when he entered the temple, to draw aside the veil and to look within the awful room, expecting to find some image, some sensible object to represent the God of the Jews, but—"there was nothing." Not without its suggestiveness on this point also, is the fact that the Maccabean Jonathan became High Priest as well as King, although he was not a descendant of Aaron, and thus the divinely established Aaronic priesthood was destroyed long before the birth of Jesus.

Why, then, did not the Messiah come immediately at the close of the Old Testament Canon? It may be said that it was necessary to allow a period to intervene during which the divinely given truths and discipline should work without a special preternatural guidance, so that it might be seen that even such rich truths would not themselves redeem; that even truth, without the one to whom the truth pointed, would fail. But during that period another influence had to be brought upon the stage with its treasures also prepared for doing the work of the Redeemer when He should become incarnate.

We accept in its literality the account which Josephus gives (*Antiquities* 11: 8) of the dream that Alexander the Great reported on his interview with the Jewish High Priest. God had appeared to him and had promised to make him triumphant over the Persians; and, on account of that, Alexander

reverenced the High Priest and treated the Jewish people with distinguished favor. And we start from this as a proof that Greece, which Alexander was leading to its position as the next world-conqueror, was then being brought forward by God for its work of preparation for Christ and Redemption.

What was that work? Let the answer be drawn from the undoubted facts of history. The Greek literature leavened and finally controlled the Jewish mind. The nation became largely Hellenized. The Old Testament was translated into Greek as the Septuagint, and that became the best known version of their Scriptures to the Jews themselves and to the neighboring nations. The New Testament was written in Greek. The early Christian literature was Greek. Greek forms of investigation and thought took possession of the Bible truths, and gave them their earliest systematic expression.

The Egyptian successors of Alexander, the Ptolemies, set deliberately to work to influence the Jews by the Greek literature; and they succeeded. The Syrian branch of Alexander's successors, who afterward conquered the land, tried to force the Jews to accept the peculiar and grosser religious rites of the Greeks; but they ignominiously failed, and only succeeded in producing that narrow and exclusive bitterness in the Jewish mind against the Gentile world, which was manifest until and in the time of Christ. That bitter narrowness was not the earlier Jewish feeling. It was not the spirit of their law. It did not exist under the Persian domination, nor under Alexander and his immediate successors. It was a result of the persecution by Antiochus Epiphanes, just as, in modern times, the persecution of the Scotch Covenanters developed bigotry in them.

This difference between the Ptolemies and the Seleucidæ reveals the divinely appointed work of the Greek mind in the true religion.

Dean Stanley goes too far in saying (*American Sermons*, 245) that "Socrates brought down philosophy from heaven to earth." But Socrates did revolutionize Greek philosophic thought; he brought before the Greeks new moral truths, and placed older ones in a clearer light; he originated the proper mode of philosophizing; and through Plato and Aristotle, his

influence in the development of the Christian theology has been controlling.

The great substance of divine truth contained in the Old Testament was to be formulated, for its world-wide influence beyond the Semitic and the Jewish mind, by a philosophy and a language which were to be the philosophy and the language of the world. In that language the New Testament was to be written. That language, though dead, was to be the living one for all time, so that the revealed truth could be preserved in its purity and undecaying freshness. There is a deep philosophy as well as theology in the Old Testament; but it is in the form of facts and acts, to be explored, and brought out, and systematized, as the facts of nature have to be discovered and arranged under their laws. It was not reached by speculation or reasoning, "but by authoritative utterances which faith welcomes as the truth," and which reasoning can take up and further develop. The training of the Jews was essentially moral, that of the affections and the will; but reason has its offices to discharge also. It was, therefore, meet as the Old Testament Canon of revelation was closing that Socrates, the great apostle of reason and moral speculation, should appear with the method of investigation which peculiarly undermines error, if it does not immediately discover truth; so that, as Clement of Alexandria says: "Philosophy was given as a peculiar Testament to the Greeks as forming the basis of Christian philosophy." Thus two Old Testaments or Covenants, though of different value and importance, prepared the way for the one New Testament. For the full exhibition of the great doctrine-facts of the Bible, "the inductive reasoning and general definition," which Aristotle declared marked the teaching of Socrates, have their proper place. And it is significant that the Grecian mind and literature exhibited no further growth after it accomplished its Christian work.

Time had to be given for that philosophic language fully to develop itself and to permeate the Jewish mind before the final Revelation should be embodied in it. It was necessary, too, that the religion which underlay the Greek philosophy and literature should be permitted thoroughly to sift itself, so that what was pure in expression might be incorporated into the Christian revelation, and that the impure might condemn

itself, in its immoral fruits, as exhibited in the heathen world when Christ came, and as depicted especially by Paul in his Letter to the Romans.

The religion of Greece, as it appears in Homer, "was the most purely literary religion that ever existed." Great as were its moral defects, "it repudiated the worship of inanimate bodies and animals; it greatly retrenched the iniquities with which Asia had already polluted its religion; and it expelled altogether the very basest of those elements, which it was left for later and more polished times to reintroduce." "Its offerings to the gods were in singular accordance with those which the patriarchs of the East had practiced, and which Moses prescribed on divine authority." The "notes of kin to the written records and oral reports of the Hebrews appear to be as conspicuous as is the want of anything which could associate them with another source." It is even suspected that "the Apollo of the poems is really founded on the Hebrew tradition, that there should be a woman whose seed was to redeem the world." And in reference to much of their theanthropism, "it is not difficult to see how this refined association of the divine with the human nature may have supplied a preparatory school, in which the Greek mind was trained for the reception 'in the fulness of time' of the Christian dogma" (Gladstone's "Homer.") Connect with this the remarkable theological teachings which Æschylus and Sophocles especially drew from the old traditions, and the still purer efforts of Socrates and Plato, who, in the words of Prof. Plumptre, standing forth "as witnesses to the divine unity" sought to counteract the corrupting influence of the current mythology. And we can see what an admirable providential selection it was which prepared that language and literature as the permanent casket in which were to be deposited the consummate jewels of revealed truth.

But something more was needed: the establishment of an empire which should be influenced by the same language and have a control of the world, so that the treasures of revelation could be carried everywhere. This was afforded by the rise and extension of the power of Rome to a degree that no other government had ever reached, giving greater room for the "universal plan of history," and, itself first subdued by the

Greek literature and language, carrying them with their rich stores to the ends of the earth. Moreover, under Rome, Herod the Great was providentially raised up to exhibit a remarkable combination.

"In him the East and the West were united. By birth an Edomite on the father's side, and an Ishmaelite on the mother's, he represented a third great division of the Semitic race by his nominal adoption of the Jewish religion. Yet his life was entirely moulded by conceptions borrowed from the two great Aryan races of the ancient world; his conceptions of policy and government were entirely Roman, his ideal of life and enjoyment entirely Greek. And in addition to this, he was surrounded by a body-guard of Barbarian mercenaries. At no previous or subsequent period could a world-religion have been more easily preached than it was among the heterogeneous elements which were brought together by his singular tyranny" ("Farrar's Life of Christ," I: 25, n.)

The divine work of those four hundred years was more varied, more widely extended, more complex, than any that had been accomplished before. The account of it, and of all that was necessary to it, could not have been embraced in an inspired volume of convenient size, such as was possible when the Jewish life was restricted to its narrow land. A large part and it is contended the better part, of the nation never returned from Babylon. The Babylonian influence all along was tremendous and far-reaching. In the days of Alexander and immediately afterward, a colony was established in Alexandria which in the end outshone the Babylonian. The Jews became dispersed everywhere through the known world, and had much to do with the production of that wide expectation of a coming Deliverer which existed when Jesus was born, so that this may well be styled "Israel's missionary age." It was impossible to bind all these up in one harmonious account similar to the Old and the New Testament. The narrow, though deep, stream which burst forth from Horeb, divided, after Malachi, into three wide branches, with innumerable smaller rivulets, whose course it would have been impossible to follow as the earlier history had been followed in the Old Testament.

The historical books of the New Testament fit in beautifully with this view. Matthew connects especially with the Jewish prophecies and deals with the Jewish mind. Luke, by carrying the genealogy of Jesus beyond Abraham and up to Adam, hints that it is his purpose to give the Christian religion a world-wide bearing for humanity, while in the Acts he commences its historical extension among the Gentile nations.

Mark has the air of a Roman, whose power was over all the earth. John showing most of all the contact with the Grecian Platonic philosophy in his doctrines and in his expressions, at the very outset sweeps further back than Luke, commences with the creative fiat of the Divine Word, antagonizes the errors of the Grecian philosophy even while showing the influence of its truths, and, after carrying the Christian mind to its highest development, depicts in his Apocalypse the drama of the ages, gathering in the nations of the world, until all evil is overthrown and heaven settles down upon earth.

What is the practical outcome of all this?

1. Boldly face the facts which are brought to light by the science of Comparative Religion. Blinkers are *not* better than spectacles in the discovery of truth. We need not shrink from the issue which Max Müller raises by the assertion :

"He must be a man of little faith who would fear to subject his own religion to the same critical tests to which the historian subjects all other religions. We need not surely crave a tender or merciful treatment for that faith which we hold to be the only true one."

It fears not. But its history gives it the legal presumption in its favor. The burden of proof rests on those who would tear from it any of the claims which, in the Christian consciousness, it has always been understood to make. Test it by all means; but do not commence the test with the assumption that it has been a deceiver through all its past existence, and that the Christian world for eighteen centuries failed to understand it.

2. Maintain that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments stand on a peculiar, inspired, authoritative, infallible plane; revealing all the essential truths of redemption; compactly holding the practical precepts of religion and of life; and containing the standard by which all other Scriptures are to be tried. We may admit that

'the only secure basis for Religion consists in man's own religious consciousness ;, since it is as impossible that any Revelation should make a man religious, whose inner nature does not respond to its teachings, as that any instruction should make a man a musician, who has not got a 'musical ear'' (Carpenter's "Mental Physiology," p. 700).

But that does not involve the error of the historical assailants of Christianity as the supernatural system, that "all

alleged revelations can be shown to have had analogous histories; and that, therefore, even if God exists, there is no one religion through which He has specially revealed Himself" (Mallock's "Is Life Worth Living?" p. 210). Certainly the Jewish and Christian Scriptures claim to be such a special revelation; and there is no half-way position between acknowledging that claim and rejecting them as a stupendous imposture: a most successful and beneficial imposture, however, in their history and in their influence upon men. Strange if a long-drawn-out lie could do so much for truth.

3. Admit, however, divine elements in the other religions of the world. Let us not even stop short with the statement of Augustine that "there is no religion which does not contain some grains of truth." We should not only confess, but gladly assert, that the old historic religions have underlying and running through them rich and solid veins of revealed truth which have given them their persistent power, and which we should eagerly seize hold upon and use in their bearings upon our own Scriptures and for the purpose of commending those Scriptures to the adherents of the other systems.

An article of Max Müller in the *North American Review* of June, 1879, contains some statements which illustrate how safe it is for the advocate of the highest view of the Bible to make this concession. Though claiming that it is not necessary "to look upon the sacred books of all religions except our own as necessarily the outcome of human or superhuman ignorance and depravity," he alludes to the fact that "by the side of so much that is fresh, natural, simple, beautiful, and true, they contain so much that is not only unmeaning, artificial, and silly, but hideous and repellant"; and he writes of "the wild confusion of sublime truth with vulgar stupidity that meets us on the pages of the Veda, the Avesta, and the Tripitaka." Can any such charges be made against the Christian Scriptures? If not, why not? Take those Judean writers, who, through a period of fifteen hundred years, slowly developed our Bible into the full and rounded form in which it appears, and place them on a level with the writers of the books of the other religions; how can their preservation from "vulgar stupidity" be accounted for? The question is the more incisively sharpened by the comparison, which Max Müller further

makes, that if the Jewish Apocrypha, and the Talmud, and the New Testament Apocryphal books were bound up with, and a part of, our Bible we should have something like the exhibition which is made by the books of the other religions. Precisely so. But in the other books there *is* the confused intermingling. Our Book has rejected the very elements which subject the others to the damaging charges made against them. That places it on a peculiar pinnacle. No principle of natural selection will explain it. There was a superhuman superintendence which built up our Book and kept out of it what would have marred it and corrupted its moral influence.

4. As we come in contact with other religions, which in earlier ages were separated from the Jewish and Christian, welcome whatever is good in them, and weave it under, and in illustration and enforcement of, our own. No doubt the average Christian mind needs to be clarified on this point. Missionary appeals once misled the masses into the idea that all the heathen religions were essentially demoralizing, and nothing but demoralizing, in every way. But a change has taken place. A recent volume from the pen of a Presbyterian missionary to Japan, and issued by the Presbyterian Board of Publication ("The Sunrise Kingdom," by Mrs. Julia D. Carothers), makes such a concession as this (p. 32): "Buddhism is a wonderful system, and has a powerful influence over the human mind. Sometimes it appears in a refined and cultivated form, and its votaries are scholarly men. Even Christian missionaries cannot fail to commend the humanizing influences of this system." This is in the spirit of Dr. Schaff's remark (in his "Church History," 1:168) that "the noblest and most effectual way of defending Christianity is not to condemn everything which preceded it, to turn all the virtues of distinguished heathens into splendid vices, but rather to make them testify in its favor." Let the historic religious systems of the world be dealt with in the same spirit. The Gospel will be greatly the gainer. Max Müller has claimed that "true Christianity seems to become more and more exalted, the more we appreciate the treasures of truth contained in the debased religions." He does not mean by true Christianity all that those of us do who hold the doctrines of plenary inspiration and vicarious atonement; but his remark is more true from our stand-point than

from his. The missionary power of the Church of Christ will be mightily intensified by emphasizing the true and the good that are found overlaid by the false and the bad, rather than by magnifying the bad and the false to the utter rejection of the good and the true, in the systems whose adherents it seeks to convert.

5. Resist the attempts which are persistently made to array Culture and Religion against each other, and to force a contradiction between natural and revealed religion. Green (in the third volume of his "English History," p. 333), speaking of the Latitudinarian writers of the Restoration says: "From this moment indeed the work of English theologians turned from the bold assertion of the supremacy of revealed truth over natural reason to a more cautious assertion of the essential harmony of the one with the other." But surely the two may essentially harmonize as far as they embrace the same themes, and the one may control the other on the themes which are above that other. Why seek to raise a contradiction between the two positions? If it were not so serious a matter, ridicule and sarcasm and irony should sweep out of court, with contemptuous laughter, the assumption of certain rejectors of our supernatural religion that they are pre-eminently the students of Culture! As if the culture of the ages were not found among the believers in God and immortality! As if the really great writers, who have influenced the race, have been those who sat

"Apart, holding no form of creed
And contemplating all!"

6. Hold fast to the old creeds in which, under the influence of the Greek philosophy, the doctrines of the Bible became crystallized. Some would have us treat those symbols as the cast-off clothing of an ignorant age. In truth, as one of the results of the study of Comparative Religion, they are advanced to a high position. God prepared the Greek language and philosophy for their work in His Church. In the development of the understanding of His revealed truths through conflict with error, they were made to serve His purpose and express the faith of His people. The Church has never gone back on a doctrine once clearly formulated. It has kept reaching on to a deeper and clearer apprehension of the "unsearchable

riches of Christ, and to make all see what is the dispensation of the mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God (who created all things by Jesus Christ), to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God according to the eternal purpose which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord; the mystery which had been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to His saints; to whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you the hope of glory; whom we preach, warning every man and teaching every man in all wisdom" (Eph. iii. 9, 10; Col. i. 27, 28.)

R. M. PATTERSON.

V.

PREACHING AND MODERN SCEPTICISM.

THE religious scepticism of our age, though almost entirely without the Church, is of such a character as in some degree necessarily to affect its *ministry*. It is an *intellectual* scepticism, and ministers are ordinarily intellectual men. It is a scepticism that moves in a sphere of thought and inquiry, with which the studies of ministers have made them more or less familiar; and as among the leaders of this sceptical thought are numbered some of the finest intellects of the world, so does the scholarly life and literary associations of ministers bring them with these men into a kind of brotherly contact and sympathy.

Modern unbelief is also characterized by a certain delicacy and refinement that add very largely to its power of indirectly affecting the ministry. Looking back to the days of Voltaire and Paine, or perhaps to any other past age of unbelief, nothing strikes one more than its coarseness, its bitter hate of Christianity, and the shrill blasphemies that it uttered against the Church. But all that is largely changed now.

Guizot, in speaking of the eulogies that modern sceptics pronounce upon the character of Christ, remarks that "it would seem as if they desired to restore to Jesus as a man that superiority of which they deprive Him in refusing to see in Him the Godhead."

There is, likewise, in the scepticism of our age, a spurious religiosity, and a sham devoutness, a borrowing and wearing in public view of some of the insignia of the Church of Christ, which greatly increases the peril of which we are speaking. Modern unbelief is at times eloquent in heavenly aspirations. "It has very much to say of the All-Father." It is weary of a gross, passionate, sinful world. It continually affirms "the sacred obligation of truth," and supposes that this affirmation gives dignity to its protests against Christian doctrine: a max-

im for which it is wholly indebted to that very Church and Bible which it assails; and while any true faith in prayer certainly demands a personal God, and without Him can be nothing but empty wind, modern infidelity by no means either forbids or rejects it. It simply has its own philosophical theory of the subject. The only virtue of all pious aspirations and expressions it affirms is reflective.

But in thus speaking of the religious scepticism of our age as of such a character as necessarily to affect the Christian ministry, we would not be understood as indicating that their dogmatic faith, either in the truth of Christianity itself, or in that of any of its great doctrines is, by reason of this scepticism, in special peril. True; in the days of Voltaire and the French Encyclopædists, Golet, the Bishop of Paris, publicly abjured the Christian faith, and in his apostasy was followed by a large number of his clergy: "Priests rejoicing," says Alison, "in the new license, flung away in many instances their sacred vestments, declaring that their whole life had been a hypocrisy." But no such spectacle as that can be repeated in our day. The faith of God's ministers in His word is with us, built upon a foundation too firm to be overthrown. The influence to which we allude, of the religious scepticism of our day upon the *ministry*, regards their public utterance of divine truth—their modes of presenting to men the Gospel, the themes upon which they discourse,—their preaching.

We propose then, in this article, to discuss the relations of modern sceptical thought to preaching. Is the pulpit in any peril from this thought? and does it either in its character, or by reason of its prevalence, make upon the pulpit any special demands?

And here, in answering the first question that our theme suggests, it may be well for us to consider what the enemies of Christianity aver has already been the influence of modern unbelief upon preaching. They affirm that it has very largely banished from the pulpit all presentation of that great body of orthodox religious doctrine known as systematic theology. Says a writer of this class, in a recent Number of the *North American Review*, December, 1879:

"An exceedingly suggestive circumstance is seen in the almost total disappearance of the old-fashioned doctrinal sermon from a very large class of our fashionable pul-

pits. A heathen desiring to learn the doctrines of Christianity, might attend the best of these churches for a whole year, and not hear one word of the torments of hell, or of the anger of an offended Deity, and not enough of the fall of man, or the sacrificial sufferings of Christ, to offend the most bigoted disciple of evolution. . . . And all this," adds this writer, "is simply because the demand for doctrinal preaching is dying out. The law of supply and demand in our day controls sermons as well as flour, doctrines as well as dry-goods."

The statement is an exaggeration so great, as at once to be apparent to every candid mind, and hence is entirely impotent of harm. But is there in this falsehood nothing of truth? The sceptical thought of our day—is it not possible that it may have so slowly and unconsciously affected the ministry, that like the victims of the fabled Circe, they may not at

"once perceive their foul disfigurement,
But boast themselves more comely than before."

No candid mind can doubt but that the *drift* of modern preaching is *away* from the *formal* presentation of the great and essential doctrines of Christianity. To say that in the orthodox pulpits of our land, there is any *intended repression* of doctrine, we do not believe is true; but to say that in them there is a want of the *direct expression* of doctrine cannot, we suppose, be denied. Ministers do not preach in these days as they did half a century ago, and their "new departure" regards largely the topics of their discourse. Indeed the *fashion* of the modern pulpit in some quarters is to rule out all these old topics of remark. Men affirm that the pulpit must be artistic, æsthetic, emotional, and that nothing so tame and jejune as these articles of the Church's dogmatic faith, are consistent with its popularity. And the pulpit yielding, in *some measure* at least, to these demands, it must be acknowledged that we have in the place of that Bible-truth which ought always to enrich it, the dialectics of philosophy, the speculations of theory, the imagery of rhetoric, the homilies of ethics, or anything else that the ingenuity of men can spin and weave into beautiful fabrics of thought, without the warp and woof of scriptural doctrine.

And in confirmation of this statement, reference might with great propriety be made to the character of those contributions that the pulpit has recently made to the literature of our times, indicating something at least of the drift of preaching. Nothing in these sermons is more noticeable than the

general absence of all doctrinal statement and discussion ; and the election of themes only indirectly related to Christianity ; themes ethical or politico-religious, and themes suggested by those almost endless points of contact which Christianity has with man's relations either to society or the State.

And then, even when the pulpit of this day does touch upon themes directly doctrinal, here are questions with regard to it that we should do well to ask : Is the tone that it assumes never largely apologetic ? Does it never seek to impart new interest to an old faith, not by any freshness of discussion, but by creating a new vesture with which to clothe it, a vesture of a mystic or philosophic texture ? Does it never strongly incline to a shadowy or symbolic interpretation of a doctrine ? Never defend it with unmeaning generalities ; or even assume toward it a temporizing attitude, so modifying perhaps its statement, or so explaining away its meaning as to make it less offensive to unbelief.

And all this we are constrained to believe is largely an unconscious result of modern infidelity. The pulpit either *practically represses* doctrine, or preaches it indirectly and evasively because the religious scepticism of this age has made such preaching unpopular. This, we might almost have said, was one of the victories of modern free-thinking. It has created an atmosphere uncongenial to the discussion of religious doctrine. Men, in our Christian congregations, do not indeed disbelieve these doctrines ; the storm has not dragged the anchor of their faith from its old moorings ; but, somehow or other, it has created, even in them, a distaste for such discussion ; and the pulpit has for that reason been silent.

And surely there is nothing strange in the fact that there should be just at this point a peril to the preaching of Christ's ministers, growing out of modern sceptical thought. It is against those doctrines which lie at the very basis of our orthodox system of theology, that the scepticism of this day especially arrays itself. These are the points at which it impinges upon our holy Christianity. Admit that there never was a personal Adam ; that the Bible story of the creation and fall is not history ; that man is included in that evolution of all things from primordial cells ; that conscience is a gradual growth from such small beginnings as we now see in the

domestic dog ; that the Lord Jesus Christ was nothing more to our humanity than a good example and a wise teacher ; and that justification and regeneration are nothing more than unmeaning, or at best symbolic terms ; and the so-called "advanced thinkers" of our day will cheerfully allow the Church to adorn itself with the empty remainder of Christianity. Indeed, this is the constructive suggestion of modern unbelief. Men must have a gospel, and here it is. Eliminate from Christianity all those tenets which have heretofore been considered the essentials of religious belief, and infidelity will delight to leave the Church, as a place where jaded minds may revel in poetry and imagery ; and man's emotional nature be cultivated by the charms of music and the forms of worship.

There is from the same cause another peril to preaching. All preaching to be *true* must to some extent be *new*. The late Prof. Moses Stuart, of Andover, has been called the Father of Biblical Exegesis ; and what light has that new science cast upon revelation ! But surely no preaching is true that is not in accord with that science. A minister who gives a wrong meaning to any passage of Sacred Scripture, is just so far in his preaching untrue. And the same is true of physical science. Turretin may have been able, two or three centuries ago, preaching from that passage in Ecclesiastes, "The sun also ariseth, and the sun goeth down, and hasteth to his place where he arose," to present a very forcible Biblical argument against the truth of the Copernican system of astronomy ; but since his day, all truthful preaching upon that verse, science constrains to be new. And so with regard to the Deluge, its reality and universality : arguments to prove both of these points, which were once regarded as almost conclusive, could not now be seriously mentioned in any sermon without exposing the preacher, and that very justly, to the charge of ignorance. But now recognizing the fact that in the past, the ministers of Christ have thus been led to correct the ignorance of the Church, in its previously erroneous interpretation of certain portions of God's word, how imminent to them is the peril of a hasty acceptance of professed scientific discoveries ; and a hasty adjustment of scriptural exegesis, with the view of bringing the Bible into harmony with the so-called advanced science. And this peril is not imaginary. Science is

laughing just now at what it calls the wonderful elasticity of inspiration. Take a case : It can scarcely be denied that the Sacred Scriptures, in what Canon G. Rawlinson calls their "*prima facie* aspect,"* teach the original unity of mankind, and the derivation from a single pair, of all the men and women upon the earth. It is in this way that the world has always read the divine word. But science has of late questioned the truth of this genesis of man. It has affirmed a diversity of origin for our race, and the existence of a pre-adamite Adam. And behold the new interpretations of Scripture that have in some quarters appeared, to reconcile *revelation* with these new theories. That the passages of Scripture usually thought to indicate the genesis of mankind from a single pair need not to be understood in that sense, is now confidently asserted. This was all an example, we are told, of mistaken exegesis. Indeed, we are now assured, by what is called high authority, that the Bible teaches the very opposite. "There are passages," says the author of "The Genesis of the Earth and Man," a work edited by Mr. Reginald Stuart Poole, of the British Museum, "which clearly indicate the existence of human beings in the early times outside the circle of the Adamites or descendants of Adam and Eve, and which therefore teach, at least, a *dual* origin of mankind, the Adamites and the non-Adamites, the daughters of men and the sons of God, the posterity of Adam and the Nephilim." The first four verses of the 6th chapter of Genesis are one of these passages, and according to a new translation and exegesis of that passage, the Bible is in delightful harmony on this point, with all that the most advanced sceptical scientist could desire. And precisely the same opinion is advocated by Prof. Winchell, of Michigan University, in his recent work, entitled "Pre-adamites." The 10th chapter of Genesis, according to this writer, does not give us a genealogical table of the posterity of Noah and the distribution of the Noachites down to the date of the compilation of the account, but "a sketch of the interconnection of races."† "The Biblical Adam was a representative of the Mediterranean race, and was simply the remotest ancestor to whom the Jews can trace their descent."‡

* *Princeton Review*, 1878, p. 806.

† Page 15.

‡ Page 472.

And another illustration of the same truth is seen in the doctrine of Evolution. In the intemperate zeal of the ministry to have all science and Revelation in accord, and in its cowardly fear of anything that has the look of antagonism, behold its dalliance with this doctrine; the strained interpretations of Scripture that have been proposed in order to give the Gospel any standing in such a world, and even a theory of inspiration that claims the infallibility of the Sacred Scriptures, as covering only such facts and statements as are involved in religious teachings.

And all this is a serious peril to preaching. It impairs the confidence of the people in the Sacred Scriptures as a rule of faith. Men can never define positively what the Bible teaches, if, upon the incoming of every new theory in science, those set apart to teach it make an indecent haste to modify their interpretations of it.

And the same is true of the confidence of Christian people in the ministers who make these compromises. It is always impaired. Men cannot believe that a minister of Christ has a strong faith in the divine inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures, who is forever seeking to give the Bible a good standing with the wisdom of the world, so modifying its apparent teaching as to bring it into harmony with that wisdom.

Nor does the Christian preacher gain by such compromises any credit from sceptics themselves, or bring to their minds any religious conviction. On the contrary, they regard all such concessions as evidence of a weakening of belief in Christian doctrine; and charitably conclude of such divines, that their faith is dragging its anchor without their knowing it.

And then the fallacy that underlies all these compromises; how strikingly does it illustrate still further this peril. It supposes that theology, "the crown and queenliest of sciences," as Lord Bacon calls it, "grows from partial ignorance up to perfectness, just like any of the merely secular sciences." It forgets that Bible theology starts from infallibly revealed truth, and that here Tertullian's maxim has its most forcible application: "What is first is true, what is more recent is false." Indeed, this making haste, almost the very moment that a new theory in science is broached, to invent some hermeneutical machinery that will break off those sharp angles of any text

of Scripture that may seem to oppose it, or even crush, if needs be, the text to pieces, is to treat the science of God just as we do the sciences of man. It is to put them all on precisely the same level. Aye, more ; it is to give that infallibility to secular science which alone belongs to the theology of the Bible.

Another peril to preaching, growing out of the character and prevalence in our day of religious unbelief, should be noticed. There is great power of conviction in *positiveness*, in an authoritative utterance, in statements that are accompanied by no qualification,—in dogmatism. The church that claims to be infallible has in that very claim a potent element of success ; and no invention, or taste, or logic, or rhetoric can impart to any discourse such strength and impressiveness as will come to it from the assertion—“*thus saith the Lord.*” An overmastering belief in Christianity, and a positive and unequivocal utterance of its great truths, are, in other words, among the highest qualifications of effective preaching. “We *also* believe and therefore speak.” Behold a great element of apostolic success. “For if the trumpet give an *uncertain* sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?” Behold an inspired rebuke of all indistinctness and vagueness in the use of the spiritual gift of prophecy.

But now, to this *positiveness* in preaching is there no peril growing out of the character and prevalence in our day of religious unbelief? We have already, in this article, denied the imputation of any real decline of faith in the ministry. *It is not true*, as a popular review of our day has affirmed, that “men stagger in the pulpit, beneath the burden of their difficulties and doubts” ; nor are our Theological Seminaries what this same writer has called them, “shaky places, places where all real faith has taken its flight from many souls.” But surely, should the pulpit in the proclamation of its faith be in these days any less direct and positive than heretofore, no one could count it strange.

The scepticism of our age is very largely *agnostic*. It abounds in negatives. It denies more than it affirms. It drags all our old anchors of faith. It sets us adrift on a shoreless sea of uncertainty. It dismisses all those problems of being in which centre our highest interests, either as subjects of

God's moral government here, or as probationers for eternity, and bids us listen only to the flow and rhythm of mere phenomena. And hence, *certainty* in religion, modern unbelief derides as the acme of philosophical folly. It is *unscholarly* for a minister in this age to be *positive* in his preaching of any great Christian doctrine. Indeed, it declares that such a dogmatic self-assurance hurts both the humanities and the humilities of men. It is saying, "I am wiser than thou," "I am holier than thou."

But besides this agnosticism which laughs at all positiveness in preaching, we shall do well to observe the positiveness of this very agnosticism whenever it finds its way into the domain of revelation; for herein is the peril of which we are speaking, still further increased:

"Bibliolatry is the bane," says James Martineau, "of the Protestant pulpit. The Scriptures, in the presence of modern science, have encountered the inevitable fate of any inflexible *litera scripta*, existing side by side with ever-widening inductions. He who in this age holds on to its compacted scheme of doctrine, is obliged to ignore all history, all mental progress, and to insist that that stands as adamant, that the intellect of the age knows has long crumbled into dust."*

And to this peril should be added, that modesty and self-distrust in the preacher, which is always the result of high mental culture, and which particularly manifests itself in the presence of opposing views. The late Bishop Haven once said of John Wesley, that "his great fear of an educated ministry was the getting of *too many* 'if's' and 'perhap's' and 'it maybe's' in the pulpit." Wesley seems to have thought that *ignorance* made men direct, positive, dogmatic in their speech; and that *learning* was the foe to this characteristic of preaching. And the great founder of Methodism was not here altogether in error. Men whose education brings them into the royal race of the world's scholars, and who by all their habitudes are in sympathy and brotherhood with those who pursue and love letters, are by that very fact, in an age when no inconsiderable apostasy from the Christain faith has taken place in that brotherhood, in peril of a lack in their utterances of divine truth, of directness and positiveness.

* Oliver Wendell Holmes' recent article on Jonathan Edwards in the *International Review* is a painful illustration of the truth of this remark. Take such a sentence as this, "Edwards' system seems in the light of to-day to the last degree barbaric, mechanical, materialistic, pessimistic."

Such are some of the perils to the pulpit of modern sceptical thought. We desire in this article to notice, with as much liberty as possible, the special demands that that thought, in its character and prevalence, makes upon the pulpit. At the time of our Saviour's advent, many forms of religious scepticism and of pronounced religious error prevailed in Palestine. All the great sects of the Jews embodied in their creeds dangerous heresies. The Pharisees were *moralists* and *ritualists*. They mistook the husk for the kernel of religion. The Sadducees were naturalists, perhaps materialists. They denied the Providence of God in human affairs. They were theistic evolutionists. They denied the existence of angels and of spirits. They did not believe in the resurrection, or in the future life. The Essenes were ascetics. They were the monks and nuns and religious quietists of that age, and held to all those errors of doctrine and life that have always characterized the monastic orders.

And then, besides these heresies which belonged distinctively to the three great sects of the Jews, there are unmistakable traces in the New Testament of a belief in the Egyptian metempsychosis, and in this life as a state of exact retribution.

But our dear Master thus brought into a continued contact with error, it is a noticeable fact that He seldom sought directly to refute it. Christ's preaching was in no proper sense controversial. He very rarely made positive attempts *simply* to dislodge false views of truth from the minds of His countrymen. His approach to them was not by a bold negation of their error, but by the affirmative annunciation of a positive truth. His mode of dealing with wrong views of truth was not so much to expel them by argument, as to drive them out by the expulsive power of their own great correlative and antagonistic test. Christ dealt with a wrong creed exactly as He did with a wrong affection. Men everywhere loving idolatrously this world, Jesus would take away from them that affection only by giving them a nobler love. And the example of Christ is here particularly instructive to the modern preacher. Surrounded with error, and seeking its overthrow, not by arguments that would disprove it, so much as by antagonistic truths that would expel it: thus should it be with us. The *polemics* of theology have no comparison in impor-

tance with its *dogmatics*. A vehement denial of error is never so effective as a bold proclamation of truth. "You cannot shovel out darkness," said John Newton, "but you can shine it out." It is an endless task in the physical world to be uprooting weeds; but plant the ground with wholesome vegetation, and the juices which would have otherwise fed rankness, pouring themselves into a more vigorous growth, will soon cause all the weeds to dwindle and die.

The first demand, then, that the sceptical thought of this age makes upon the pulpit is the preaching of a *positive faith*,—the exposition and enforcement of Bible doctrine.

Never should the pulpit cling closer to the strongholds of inspiration than at such a time as this. To unfold Scripture doctrine, to define its boundaries, to marshal in the order and majesty of a demonstration its proofs, and vigorously to press its claims upon the intellect and heart of men, is to-day the *minister's great business*.

But in doing this, is the pulpit to have no relations whatever to the sceptical thought of our times? Is it to ignore even the existence of such thought, and count it as *nothing*—so far, we mean, as its direct teachings are concerned—that the every-day reading of the very people who on the Sabbath wait upon its ministration, is all saturated with this infidel poison? This is exactly what some affirm. A reviewer of a volume of sermons, very recently published by a distinguished divine of our country, says:

"It is a positive relief to find a volume of contemporary sermons so free as this from the phrases of the intellectual battle-field. It is a rest to mind and soul that Darwinism, evolution, development, and all their congeners, are so seldom met with in these pages." (*Scribner's*, 1879, p. 612).

But are all sermons to be like these?

And whatever the Christian minister has to do with the sceptical thought of his day, is it to be relegated to that sphere in which he moves as a member of one of the learned professions? A writer in a recent Number of the *Princeton Review** maintains this position. But is it true? Do the scriptural limitations of the subjects of preaching rule out of the pulpit all such themes? That there are whole paragraphs and chapters in the Bible that do not touch, even indirectly, either

* *Princeton Review*, January, 1879.

the Gospel plan or Christian experience, must be conceded. And if "all Scripture is profitable for instruction in righteousness," is it not an unwarrantable limitation of that Gospel which the minister is to preach, to regard it as including only those great doctrines which are directly connected with salvation? It is reported of Dr. Chalmers, that while listening to the converse of McCheyne, and Burns, and the Bonars, and hearing them say, "Precious Jesus," so much, he exclaimed: "A most excellent brotherhood of men, if only they might have done with their *nursery* endearments."* We cannot say that we have any sympathy with this remark of that great Scotch divine; yet always to present in the pulpit "the principles of the doctrine of Christ," and never "go on unto perfection," is certainly to lay it open to a just application of this remark of Chalmers.

But in thus claiming for the ministry the right in the pulpit to meet the sceptical thought of our times—we need hardly add that the exercise of this right demands the most careful discrimination. It is said by scientific chemists, that rivers, in the peculiar character of their water, reveal the peculiar geological formations through which they flow. Separating from the rocks that they wash, and from the *débris* that comes into their channels, very minute particles, that by and by are entirely assimilated and absorbed, the ultimate result is a river; in the chemical analysis of whose waters we have a history of all its meanderings. And should in any instance the geological formation through which a river flows, be of such a character as very easily to be taken up by the water, the result is such an impregnation of the river by its particles, as even to be discerned by the naked eye, and to give the river (as is the case of the Red River of Arkansas) its distinctive name. We have no hesitation in affirming that it should be precisely thus with preaching. While no age should give to preaching its *substance*, its *great and distinctive themes*,—any more than a limestone bottom gives a river its water—yet it should give to preaching its *coloring* and taste, just as that limestone bottom gives both of these things to the river. Says James Martineau, in one of his addresses before the Manchester New College, London:

"Not even the most rigid theologian can live exclusively with what he regards as the

* "Studies in the New Testament" p. 161.

constants of religion. Fix these as he may, he finds himself in a changing scene, with the *variables* of which he is in immediate contact, and the relations between the immutable data of his creed, and the three differing conditions of human life have to be re-adjusted as new ideas and wants arise. To qualify himself for this, and become a proficient in *applied religion*, he must know how the world is going on; follow in the track of the advancing sciences, listen to the *tones* of the younger literature, and breathe the air of other men's thought. He cannot act as trustee of the deposit committed to him, unless he looks around him and sees how it is to be administered, in the altered temper of the generations as they rise, what doubts it has to meet, what repugnance to encounter, by what fresh paths of approach it must reach minds now transported into uncalculated latitudes" (Essays, p. 413).

And has not this always been true of the pulpit in its very best days? Preaching the *constants* of Christianity in all time, has not the age largely decided as to its *variables*? In the history of the foundation of doctrinal theology,—Christology, anthropology, and soteriology in turn, the great subjects of discussion in the Church, and the subjects in connection with which arose various forms of unbelief,—did not each of these successively impart to the preaching of the age its own distinctive character? Says Professor Porter in his "Homiletics":

"Such is the influence of the pulpit on public sentiment, and such the *reaction* of public sentiment on the pulpit, that in the most important respects the state of the Church in any given period may be determined from the prevalent strain of preaching during that period. . . . At one time all its powers have been directed by some great heresy in the Church; and at another an overwhelming current of public feeling and opinion has been occasioned by some great subject of duty or danger, involving the common interests of the Church. For a hundred years after Luther's time, scarcely a sermon was delivered in any Protestant pulpit, without alluding to the usurpations of the Papal hierarchy."*

And thus measurably at least should it be now. Those doctrines of our holy religion which directly antagonize modern unbelief, should be especially preached, and they should be preached in that antagonism. Men should see that there is a "Thus saith the Lord," in opposition to all these speculations of a world-wise philosophy. And while we would not affirm that it is the province of the pulpit directly to follow unbelief in all its forms, and directly attempt its refutation, we do affirm that the pulpit should bear in the presence of all this sceptical thought of our day, a manly and intelligent face, and should raise its voice in firm rebuke.

But the sceptical thought of our day, when regarded particularly as to its prevalence, the mastery that it has gained

* "Lectures on Homiletics," p. 70.

over so many minds, and what may properly be called its democratic character and aim, makes one other imperious demand upon the pulpit.

Luther had an apothegm about preaching, which—if it was not designed to express the same truth which Archbishop Leighton expresses, when he says, “it takes all our learning to make us plain,”—can only be true, in our times, in cases wholly exceptional: “*Qui trivialiter, pueriliter, vulgariter docet, optime docet.*” But, alas! some good people have just this idea of preaching.

John Foster, in one of his letters, tells us of men, in his day accounted wise expounders of the Word, who expressed “what can scarcely be called thought in what as little deserves to be called style, and who are intelligible to an audience for the simple reason they really say nothing.” In a satire upon the English clergy of the last century, by William Coombe, in a book entitled “*Letters of Lord Littellton*,” we read of a parson who lost his only sermon, and here is his description of that sermon’s almost endless possibilities: “It had four beginnings and seven conclusions, by the help whereof I preached it with equal success on a Christmas-day, for the benefit of a charity, at a florist’s feast, an assize, an archdeacon’s visitation, and a funeral, besides common occasions.”

But surely the day of either John Foster’s or of William Coombe’s parson is over. Behold the change that, since Luther’s apothegm, has taken place in the general culture and intelligence of the people. Education, then a difficult possession of the few, is now the comparatively easy attainment of all. Behold what we have called the democracy of modern unbelief. See how it seeks to permeate the masses; how the common people hear it gladly; how it pervades the current literature of our day; how men read it in novels, magazines, newspapers, and hear it in popular lectures. And now in all this lifting up of popular education and in this wide diffusion of sceptical thought, can any doubt the duty of the pulpit? Does not all this imperiously demand its elevation to a much higher intellectual standard than that it has ever before attained? Should you chain a vessel to a laden dock so firmly that when the tide comes in the vessel cannot move, will not

the Thames soon entirely submerge it? Aye, more! In order so to keep that vessel that it may be always ready either to discharge its old cargo, or to receive a new one, must it not be so placed as to rise and fall with the tide's ebbing and flowing? It is precisely thus with the pulpit. Chain it to the culture and thought of society an hundred years ago so firmly that it cannot or does not move, and the culture and thought of to-day will bury it many fathoms deep. For real power, the pulpit must rise proportionally with every incoming tide of education and learning. "One of the reasons," says a popular writer of our day, "for the lack of popular attraction to the pulpit lies in the fact that *brains* enough are not put into the sermons." "The thinking in a sermon," he adds, "must be superior to the average thinking of an audience, to produce any effect upon it; and if in these days any man—no matter how gifted he may be—imagines that he may halt in his enterprise of earnest and profound preparation for his preaching without damage to himself, he is sadly mistaken. His slipshod stuff will be detected every time and pass to his discredit." (*Scribner's*, Dec., 1879). An honored professor in one of our theological seminaries, now glorified in heaven, the translator and editor of Vinet's "Pastoral Theology," in quoting from that work the counsel of Vinet, "Have you an audience composed of forty-nine wise and one ignorant, speak for that ignorant one," says: "We agree, but must add: Have you an audience of forty-nine ignorant and one wise, forget not this wise one's presence. His judgment of merit in discourse is the only one you should have respect to." And when these demands made upon the pulpit by the sceptical thought of our age shall be met, it only remains that we should add that the *perils* which come to it from that thought will be thus averted.

That the days of the pulpit's power in our world are over, is an affirmation just now in certain quarters very often made. But we cannot believe it. The great Head of the Church has been too wise to make any mistake in His election of *preaching* as the great instrumentality for the world's evangelization. Moreover, of the darkness that may seem now to gather about Christianity, let no one fear that it is its *sunset*. It is simply its temporary eclipse. The orb of the spiritual day is still climbing the skies, and when its occultation is over, nearer to

the zenith than ever before, its beams of light and heat will only be brighter and warmer.

When the good Quaker, Pastorius, the hero of Whittier's "Pennsylvania Pilgrim," was deeply depressed by his failure to open the eyes of his fellow-colonists to see the evil of slavery, and found that his "*own folk*" were even as others,—

"Yea, our goodliest *friends*
Are frail, our *elders* have their selfish ends,
And few dare trust the Lord to make amends
For duty's loss."

The poet represents the wife of Pastorius as—

"Touching with finger-tip an aloe rife,
With leaves sharp-pointed like an Aztec knife."

And as thus speaking :

"See this strange plant its steady purpose hold,
And year by year its patient leaves unfold,
Till the young eyes that watched it first are old.
But sometime, thou hast told me, there shall come
A sudden beauty, brightness, and perfume,
The century-moulded bud shall burst in bloom.
So may the seed which hath been sown to-day
Grow with the years, and after long delay
Break into bloom and God's *eternal Yea*."

Not entirely unlike those days of darkness to that would-be philanthropist, seems sometimes this age of ours to the minister of Jesus Christ. But to him there is the hope of the future, *much more* than that simple certainty of ultimate triumph which grows out of the mere germinal nature of all truth. He has the certain promise of the Master he serves: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations. And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen."

HENRY DARLING.

VI.

NOTES AND NOTICES.

The General Synod of the Reformed (Dutch) Church met in Hudson, N. Y., on the first day of June, and continued in session eight days, Dr. I. S. Hartley, *President*; and Dr. James Demarest, Jr., *Adressor*. The whole number of delegates present was 148.

The reports received on the state of religion indicated prosperity in every respect save increase in full communion. No awakenings are mentioned, and the numbers added during the year were five hundred less than in the preceding year. In Foreign Missions over \$92,000 were received, completely extinguishing a large debt which had been pressing for several years, and threatened to become chronic. The contributions for Domestic Missions and Church Building were over \$29,000, a slight increase over the previous year. In Ministerial Education there was an increase of \$3,000, and the Board of Publication diminished its debt by more than \$2,000. The Widows' Fund (\$54,000) and the Disabled Ministers' Fund (\$49,000) were shown to be in a prosperous condition.

No judicial cases occupied the time of the body. Early in the sessions a spirited debate sprang up on the proposition to send delegates to a National Temperance Convention at Saratoga. This was declined, as was also a resolution to raise a Committee on the general subject, and the final action was a reaffirmation of the deliverances on temperance made in 1875 and 1877. In some of these there is a perilous approach to the doctrine that any use of intoxicating drinks, however moderate, is sinful; a doctrine which stands in flagrant contradiction to the Word of God.

There were three matters of special interest which came before the Synod.

1. One was the question of Freemasonry. Certain of the Classes in the West had taken the ground that the toleration of secret, oath-bound societies was inconsistent with the welfare, if not the existence, of the Church, and demanded adverse legislation thereon. Wise action on the subject was taken by the Synod last year (see this REVIEW, October, 1880, p. 734), but the matter came up again by memorials from various Classes, and was urged with great feeling and earnestness by certain brethren. After they had been heard at full length the Synod, by a decisive vote, declared that while it had no sympathy with the Societies complained of, still it had neither the power nor the disposition to interfere with the lower bodies in the exercise of discipline save in the manner prescribed by the Constitution. It is hoped that this position against the establishment of new tests of church membership, deliberately taken last year

and reaffirmed this year, will ultimately be accepted by the Western brethren, and put an end to an agitation which is productive of harm rather than good.

2. Another matter of importance was a memorial from the Classis of Poughkeepsie, which objected to certain clauses in our Form of Baptism as ambiguous and burdensome to tender consciences, and asked that relief should in some way be given. The clauses are those in which the applicant confesses himself "wholly incapable of doing any good and prone to all evil," and assents to "all the articles of the Christian religion as taught in this Church." The memorialists said, and no one doubts their entire sincerity, that they had themselves no scruple in the matter, but cordially accepted both statements in the fullest extent. They said, however, that there were good people who could not conscientiously subscribe these statements, and yet in other respects were unobjectionable, and were therefore shut out from church-fellowship. The Synod adopted, *nem. con.*, a paper which insisted that all the difficulties suggested could be removed by the "private instruction" expressly mentioned in the Baptismal Office, and therefore no change was required; that no modification or interpretation of the language of the Symbols could secure it against misconception; that the action asked for would be dangerous, and might be regarded as a sign of waning loyalty to our standards; and that it would wound and distress many more of God's elect than it would comfort and keep. The tone of the debate and the whole action of the Synod was such as to show beyond a doubt the doctrinal integrity of the entire Church. Yet unanimous as was the conclusion reached, it may well be a matter of consideration whether, since the language of the Reformation Symbols is understood by ordinary readers in a sense different from that which was contemplated by its authors, there should not be some explanatory statements vindicating it from plausible misrepresentations.

3. The third point of interest was the Professorship of Theology at New Brunswick. The Rev. Dr. A. B. Van Zandt, after nine years of faithful and successful service, was constrained by bodily illness to resign his position. The Synod accepted the resignation so far as the active duties of the office were concerned, and continued him during life as *Emeritus* Professor, with a touching expression of its esteem and sympathy.* The Rev. Chester D. Hartranft, D.D., now Professor of Church History in the Theological Seminary at Hartford, was unanimously appointed to be Dr. Van Zandt's successor. Dr. Hartranft being at the time in Europe, it could not be learned whether or not he would accept the appointment. At the present writing it is considered probable that he will, a prospect which is very grateful to the friends of the Church in view of his profound learning, catholic spirit, varied attainments, and acute intellect.

In 1884 the Theological Seminary will complete the one hundredth year of its existence, and the Synod appointed a large committee to procure such contributions as will enable the institution to enter upon its second century with an endowment ample for all its needs.

The Synod, in common with several other ecclesiastical bodies, passed

* Within a few weeks after the closing of the Synod, Dr. Van Zandt departed this life.

earnest resolutions protesting against any further toleration of the polygamous corruption of Mormonism, and, unlike any other representative assembly so far as we know, unless it be the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (South), appointed a large committee to consider and report upon the merits of the Revised Version of the New Testament. Measures were taken also to secure the co-operation of the German Reformed Church in obtaining a standard English version of the Heidelberg Catechism, the venerated symbol of both Communions. A carefully digested plan was adopted for securing from the churches sufficient contributions to pay off the debt and increase the endowment of Hope College in Michigan. This youthful institution is intended mainly to meet the wants of the Hollandish immigration in the West, people who have brought with them a hereditary attachment to religion and learning, and insist upon having an educated ministry. The Church here agrees with them, and acts accordingly. There are those who inveigh against all small colleges, but they forget that the largest institutions were once small, and that the only hope of a liberal education for many promising young men lies in their having a seat of learning in their vicinity. They must go to a small college or to none.

TALBOT W. CHAMBERS.

The Assassination of the President.—As we now write, nearly sixty days have elapsed since President Garfield was prostrated by an assassin's shot. His life is now trembling in the balance. A day or two since it was generally despaired of. Our present hope of his recovery is founded mainly on his having survived the deadly attack so long, and on that firm manhood, physical, intellectual, moral and Christian, the medical skill, all reinforced by those united and importunate supplications of the people, which have combined thus far to ward off the fatal issue. Of all the music at our parks and watering-places, none now so stirs the listening throngs as the new national air, "God save the President." It voices the heart of the nation, thus far showing itself a Christian and not a godless nation. The specially religious lessons of this catastrophe can be better treated after it shall reach its consummation, whatever that may be. Meanwhile it has brought into conspicuous prominence some faults in the present working of our political system, which loudly demand immediate correction.

1. It has become clear that no man should be made Vice-President who is not fit to be President. Within forty years three Vice-Presidents have early in their terms of office become Presidents, in consequence of the death of their chiefs. There is a considerable chance that this may occur again. Thus there is, according to the experience of the past forty years, something like one-third of a chance that the Vice-President will be President. He should therefore always be selected in view of his recognized qualifications for the Presidency, whatever else may prompt his nomination. Otherwise there will be great danger of making men Presidents, who were never the choice of the people for that office, and will be likely to defeat the purposes of those who elected them. Such has thus far been very largely true of the administrations of all Vice-Presidents. They have been of that hybrid kind which is always a degeneration, represents no principle but the desire of the incumbent to rise from a Presidency *per accidens*, to a Presidency by popular election, and is thus offensive to

all parties. This has been due to their having been selected, not with reference to their qualifications for the Presidency, but as make-weights of a ticket to conciliate the support of some disappointed or doubtful parties or sections. In order to obtain men of the proper grade for the Vice-Presidency, some greater endowments, dignity, and power should attach to it. It should at least be made equal to the Speakership of the House of Representatives. Now the Vice-President is a mere figure-head presiding over the Senate, with no power to appoint committees, or do more than vote in case of a tie. The possibility of Presidential succession aside, experience has proved the office very likely to tend to political insignificance and oblivion, and to offer few attractions to the highest statesmen.

Still further : it is only in the light of experience that all the defects or needed supplements or interpretations of existing laws and constitutions can be discovered. All previous vacancies in the Presidential chair have so occurred as to leave no question open as to the province of the Vice-President assuming the Presidency. As we now write no doubtful exigency has yet arisen, but all see that it is liable to arise. The subject is already vigorously discussed in the public journals. Two things clearly need to be provided for by explicit statute. First, a proper method, and, if need be, tribunal, for deciding, when any prostration of the President, bodily or mental, more than temporary sickness, and short of death, constitutes that "disability" which makes it the right and duty of the Vice-President to assume the Presidency. Secondly, a warrant for the Vice-President, like all other Vice-Presidents, to discharge temporarily the necessary routine duties of that office without thereby displacing or superseding the President, in case of the temporary absence, sickness, or other disability of the latter. If the President should continue substantially as now till Congress assembles, all can see the enormous awkwardness of the situation. Our present experience has also brought to light the need of some more adequate provision than now exists, in case of the disability or death of both President and Vice-President. Should this too occur before the meeting of Congress, where are we ? The nation would be not only "a state without a king," but without any executive head.

It is creditable to General Arthur that he shrinks from this tremendous responsibility which he may be called to bear, and of which neither he nor the people had any thought at the time of his election. Much prayer has already been offered for him that his life may be spared, and that in the contingency now possible he may be divinely guided and sustained in administering wisely and well the government of fifty millions of people. That he has apparently not yet broken the spell of personal and political associations which the people have learned to fear, is balanced by the fact that he was born and reared a child of prayer. The son of an estimable Baptist clergyman, he is now undergirded by the prayers of the nation to Him with whom all things are possible.

This dire tragedy, the direct outcome of the "spoils" system in the distribution of public offices, has, along with the contemporaneous contest pressed by politicians against the President for the control of this patronage, lifted into unexampled prominence the enormity of that system, and the need of its correction. Probably the conviction of this necessity has never been so intense

or universal. The problem is how to effect it. No stronger instance can be found of turning a good law into a letter which killeth by eviscerating it of its life-giving spirit. All the provisions of our National Constitution were of necessity tentative. They were formed when all the people of the country were less in number than the population of some single States. They were the product of consummate wisdom and statesmanship. Yet, it required the severe test of experience to disclose their weak and inadequate features. The provision conferring on the President the power of nominating, and, by and with the consent of the Senate, appointing, and of removing at pleasure, all subordinate executive officers, was designed simply to give him a power co-ordinate with his responsibility for the right administration of the Government, while it secured the aid of the Senate in detecting and excluding improper nominees. But it was never contemplated that this power would be exercised with any other intention than to secure the appointment of the fittest persons for office. In fact, however, it has for half a century been regarded and treated, not according to this ideal standard, but as a power to dispense all the public offices solely to the friends, partisans, or rather party which triumphed at the Presidential election. This brings in criteria of eligibility to office, far other, and generally more potent, than fitness for it. Beyond all else, it has depraved and debauched our politics, and aggravated the dangers of universal suffrage. For the first question in regard to any candidate for office is not, is he fit for it, but, how many votes can he command (too often *per fas aut nefas*)? What has he done or what will he do for his party? Oftener for that Senator or Representative of his party, who recommends candidates from his district or State to the President? So the public offices have, from their first prostitution to become a mere mass of party patronage, been, by a second perversion, turned into a mere lot of "spoils" for the control of which politicians and political aspirants and jobbers dicker and bicker, until, from being sources of strength, they sometimes become causes of discord and disintegration to the party in power. When a party is in the ascendant the great question arises, who shall get the mastery of the party and its patronage, in order to rule it at his own special behest, for his own special behoof? All this has reached a culmination which would have been incredible, if it had not become actual history in that strange contest begun in Washington and terminated in Albany, to which the assassination of the President, by a desperate miscreant, is largely due. It has had its fullest development in the national and local politics of the Empire State, in the struggle for mastery of factions within the respective parties, which have for the time being controlled the dispensation of the national, state, or city patronage. If parties ascendant in a Government form a virtual *imperium in imperio*, these dominant cliques or dictators in parties constitute another despotism or dynasty inside of these wheels within wheels, rings within rings. The recent desperate and maniacal struggle to deprive the President of the power intrusted to him by the Constitution to determine his own subordinates, for whose efficiency he is responsible, in order to perpetuate a despotism within the party which elected him its chosen representative, that would grind to powder all who did not bow to the unmatched egotist who had so long been permitted to tyrannize over it, by usurping the control of its offices, is among the most memorable of its kind in history. The fierce convulsions and throes

of this unique contest afford a new illustration of the remark made, if our memory serves us, by Macaulay, that the demon of despotism always rends the body which it leaves.

This perversion of public office was first begun by Jefferson, who excused his removal of some worthy political opponents from office in order to make room for his own partisans, on the ground that finding nearly all offices in the hands of the Federal party, he sought only a fair distribution of them to all parties. But he at the same time expressed the hope that, this being accomplished, the only question to be answered with respect to any candidate would be, "Is he honest, is he capable, is he faithful to the Constitution?" For about a quarter of a century afterward this standard in the main prevailed as it had from the first. When Jackson became President in 1829, a clean sweep of his political opponents from office was made, which was defended by Senator Marcy, of the U. S. Senate, on the ground, first articulated by him, that "to the victors belong the spoils." This principle has ruled ever since. Indeed, once carried out by one party, there is no alternative for the other when taking its turn in power. It dooms itself to perpetual defeat if it leaves these potent sinews of war exclusively to its opponents. Hence no reform of this great abuse is possible without the hearty co-operation of both political parties. If they, or rather their managers, wish such reform, they can and will unite in effecting it, and thus carry out the will of the people. If they do not, they will doubtless find ways of for a time thwarting the popular will, till it becomes so impatient and overwhelming as to be irresistible. So was it with the franking privilege, originally bestowed upon members of Congress for a worthy end, but prostituted to other ends till it became intolerable. Our space forbids us now to discuss or even indicate measures and methods of reform. Competitive examinations might be one of the remedies in relation to a large class of officers. But even this alone will not suffice. There must be provisions for securing additional qualifications, which no mere examination, much less an examination conducted by shallow-splurges, pedants, or martinets can detect.

The strain of allotting these offices, now so vast in number, and clutched at by so many needy and greedy seekers, puts the life and health of any President, upon a change of dominant parties, and even of administration of the same party, at great risk. It has always been understood to have had much to do with the decease of Presidents Harrison and Taylor. Before his assassination President Garfield suffered in health severely from this cause. This system at last instigated the shot of the assassin at his vitals. To President Lincoln it was, if possible, more harassing than the conduct of one of the great wars of the century. Relief some way must come. The members of the present Cabinet have become satisfied that some new system of civil service must be adopted in order to leave the heads of departments any reasonable time and strength for their appropriate duties. Other great Republican leaders concur with them. Leaders of the Democratic party are also urging it. No measure more complete for effecting the purpose has been offered than the bill presented to the last Congress by Senator Pendleton, of Ohio. May we not then hope that both parties will join in bringing about this most benign reform, possibly too, an "era of good feeling," like that under Mr. Monroe's Presidency, in which as then, "all were Republicans, all Federalists," so now, all shall be Republicans, all Democrats.

LYMAN H. ATWATER.

Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.—This new periodical, edited by Dr. Bernhard Stade, Prof. of Theology at Giessen, and sustained by the members of the German Oriental Society, proposes to relieve the pages of the Journal of the Society and also the Theological Reviews, of that great mass of critical material which has with increasing vigor been pressing for space in their pages. The Journal embraces two numbers a year. The first year, 1881, is now lying before us. The themes discussed are chiefly of the higher Biblical Criticism, and by authors who in the main adhere to the school of Graf and Wellhausen. The articles in the first half are chiefly: *Stade*, a critical study of Deutero-Zechariah; *Hollenberg*, the textual criticism of the books of Joshua and Judges; *Meyer*, criticism of the accounts of the conquest of Palestine; *Hoffmann*, on the History of the Syriac text of the Bible. The second part contains a long article by *Giesebrecht* on the language of the Elohist parts of the Hexateuch, to prove that they are postexilic, and also by the same author, an article on the time of the composition of the Psalter, to show that the entire body of Psalms, from the 2d to 5th books inclusive, is exilic or postexilic; *Stade*, upon the origin of those parts of the book of Judges that were previous to Deuteronomy in composition, and lesser articles by *Derenbourg* and *Hoffmann*. The Review is still further distinguished for a full Bibliography of Exegesis during 1880 and 1881. It is to be hoped that evangelical criticism will be stirred to new activity, and laborious work by these labors of Rationalistic Criticism.

C. A. BRIGGS.

VII.

REVIEWS OF

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

I.—EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY,

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE JEWISH CHURCH : twelve lectures on Biblical Criticism.

By W. ROBERTSON SMITH, M.A. N. Y. : D. Appleton & Co. 1881. 12mo, pp. 446.

These lectures, originally prepared for popular delivery, are eminently adapted for their purpose. Their author has a remarkable faculty for presenting subjects that are commonly regarded as dry and technical, in a lucid and attractive manner, with such clearness of statement, such aptness of illustration, and such a close logical connection, from first to last, that the interest is maintained to the end, and his readers cannot fail to gain a satisfactory comprehension of the conclusions reached, and the general nature of the grounds upon which they rest. No one can rise from the perusal of this volume without a high respect for the learning and ability of the author, and a profound impression that Biblical Criticism offers a very wide and important field for study ; an impression that will be deepened in most minds probably by the startling character of some of the opinions here confidently announced, as though they were the undoubted results of the latest and most thorough scholarship. It is exceedingly unfortunate that a volume, which has so many excellent points, and which from the peculiar circumstances attending its publication, naturally attracts so much attention, does not discriminate between facts and theories ; but after the method of the German critics, who must speak oracularly, if it all, and to whom the self-consistency of an ingenious hypothesis sufficiently recommends it, in the absence of any evidence to support it, the purely conjectural is propounded as though it were of the same unquestionable certainty with that which is really known.

These lectures throughout challenge the accuracy of the Jewish transmission of the Old Testament in respect to its text, its canon, and the constitution of its separate books. The train of investigation pursued relative to these various points opens questions of the highest consequence, both bringing to light a large amount of valuable information, and suggesting lines of inquiry that still remain to be explored ; nevertheless, from the deplorable vice already alluded to, it is so conducted as to leave an exaggerated or thoroughly false impression.

It is readily conceded that notwithstanding the substantial unanimity of Hebrew MSS., the Masoretic text is not immaculate. There are some obvious mistakes in certain books which prove this ; and the discrepancies in various parallel passages, and the incompleteness of a few acrostic poems, though largely explicable otherwise, may be partly due to faulty transcription. But, it is an immense and unwarranted stride from these premises to the assumption, that, though the Hebrew text

as it existed in the first Christian century, has been transmitted with unparalleled precision, "in earlier ages Hebrew MSS. differed as much as, or more than, MSS. of the New Testament," p. 73. The allegation, p. 78, "that the early guardians of the text did not hesitate to make small changes in order to remove expressions which they thought unedifying," is wholly unfounded. Of the eighteen so-called *Tikkûnê Sophêrîm* (corrections of the Scribes), which are adduced in proof, Prof. Smith himself admits that fifteen are irrelevant; the fact is, that in the judgment of the best critics, the entire series are mere rabbinical conceits, and warrant no suspicion whatever of any tampering with the text. "Ishbosheth" may be a contemptuous nickname, which the son of Saul "would never have consented to bear," but who can certify us that it was not current in the rival kingdom during his lifetime? or that it was not so written by the author of the books of Samuel, but was an alteration by some copyist in later times? The forced interpretations, which the scribes confessedly put upon the law,* are no evidence that they wilfully changed the written text, but the reverse; if the law could have been accommodated to their usages by altering its expressions, they would have been under no temptation to do violence to its language. It is puzzling to account for the concurrence of all existing MSS. in obvious mistakes or in such an arbitrary notation as the extraordinary points, suspended letters, and the like, but there is nothing to require or to justify the assumption of a "rigorous suppression of discordant copies," p. 75, or of a serious dissonance at any time among Hebrew MSS.

Prof. Smith complains, p. 74, that our present Old Testament text cannot be traced back beyond the fall of the Jewish state. This is to be regretted, doubtless; but it is simply due to the lack of any adequate sources of information. If, as he says of the antecedent period, p. 98, "there is not a particle of evidence that there was a uniform Palestinian text," and its existence is "a pure hypothesis," neither is there, on the other hand, a particle of evidence of a discrepant text at all approaching the "variations and corruptions found in MSS. of the New Testament"; this too is a pure hypothesis, only with the difference that all the probabilities and the inferences deducible from known facts, are against it, and establish beyond reasonable doubt that there never was any wide divergence of MSS., and that we now possess a text which is not indeed absolutely faultless, but yet substantially and even astonishingly accurate.

The only accessible witnesses to the state of the text in the pre-Christian period, outside of the line of Palestine tradition, are the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint version. Gesenius' careful analysis of the former has put an end to all thought of correcting the Hebrew text by the Samaritan; and the variant "ages assigned to the patriarchs," p. 73, are clearly due to systematic and intentional alteration and not to the errors of transcribers; they must therefore be classed with the arbitrary changes characteristic of the Samaritan recension. We are very far from any disposition to undervalue the Septuagint, or to refuse such critical aid as can fairly and legitimately be derived from it. Let it be noted that the question between the Masoretic and the Septuagint text is one of form rather than substance. If the latter were to be bodily substituted for the former, which Prof. Smith is very far from proposing, it would involve no peril to the Christian faith. This may be fairly inferred from the free use made of the LXX by the inspired writers of the New Testament. And it would be difficult to point out any appreciable change that would have resulted in the belief of the early Greek Church, had the Fathers been conversant with Hebrew, instead of being limited in the Old Testament to

* The censure impliedly cast on the author of the books of Chronicles (p. 64), is quite gratuitous. King Joash directed a temporary assessment from year to year for the repair of the temple, and fixed its rate by the example of Moses (note that the italic words in the English version of 2 Chron. xxiv. 6, form no part of the text). It is hard to see what this has to do with a voluntary arrangement in the time of Nehemiah for a different purpose, or how it appears that "the Chronicler" was under a mistake about it.

the use of the LXX. The matter involved is simply verbal precision and minute textual accuracy.

And here the Professor correctly informs us that in consequence of mistakes of the translators, p. 87, the license which they allowed themselves in various ways,* pp. 88-90, and the manifold corruptions that have since crept into the text of the LXX, p. 103, "it is an affair of the most delicate scholarship to make profitable use of the Alexandrian version for the confirmation or emendation of the Hebrew." The statement that the "readings of the Septuagint offer a fair measure of the limits of variation in the early history of the text," must accordingly be taken with very large abatement. And the formula, by which it is proposed to determine which reading is to be preferred in the illustrations given, p. 90, viz.: "in cases of this sort the shorter text is obviously the original," is by no means so settled a rule, or of so wide application, as the Professor would have us believe.

In its application to the book of Jeremiah, it is particularly unfortunate, as the elaborate discussion of Wichelhaus abundantly shows. On this point we will not venture to quote Keil, whose unfavorable judgment of the LXX text is so summarily set aside, p. 85. But Graf, the *coryphaeus* of the latest critical speculations, will perhaps be heard with more respect. After a careful comparison of the Greek and Hebrew texts of Jeremiah, he says in the introduction to his Commentary, p. li.: "after what has now been shown there can no longer be any doubt that the form of the text yielded by the Greek translator is a mutilated and corrupted one, which arose out of the text preserved to us in the Hebrew, and at a much later time." This is the more noteworthy as he tells us, *vorwort*, p. 9: "I began the work with the most favorable opinion of the LXX, but was soon led to the opposite view by the convincing power of the facts," which satisfied him that "the suspicion which has been expressed against the genuineness of certain passages in the book, particularly the prophecy respecting Babylon, chs. I, li. [which Prof. Smith appears to be prepared to surrender, pp. 112, 121], as well as the hypothesis of a double recension of the book, which has obtained almost universal prevalence in recent times, is utterly without foundation." And Delitzsch, who is certainly indulgent enough in questions of criticism, says of "the transpositions occurring in the Book of Proverbs," to which our author also refers, pp. 121, 122: "These remind one of the transpositions in Jeremiah, and rest as they do upon a mistake as to the true relations of the subject matter." *Spruchbuch*, p. 39. And Jeremiah, ch. xxvii., which is adduced to exemplify the superiority of the Greek text, affords a signal proof of the reverse; for ver. 7, whose presence in the Hebrew and absence from the Greek is one of the points remarked upon (p. 115), was certainly in the text when Chronicles was written, as appears from the manifest allusion to it 2 Chron. xxxvi. 20.

The obscurity which overhangs the final collection and arrangement of the Old Testament canon, opens a fresh opportunity for theorizing, in which a modicum of facts is mingled with a large infusion of doubtful conjectures. The presence of apocryphal books and sections in the LXX is appealed to in evidence that the extent of the canon was fluctuating and uncertain, while yet Prof. Smith confesses that these books have no proper claim to be regarded as canonical, and that they never were accepted as such by the Jews in Alexandria, or elsewhere. They were valued as aids to religious edification, but not esteemed authoritative. His notion of the process by which the Old Testament was gradually brought to its present compass is substantially as follows. The canon of Ezra was the Pentateuch alone. The divine authority of the prophets was recognized, but only as books for private edification. There was no standard edition of individual prophets, and no fixed collec-

* Prof. Smith gratuitously links copyists with translators, as though the former took the same liberties with the text as the latter. But the cases are not analogous. Translation naturally led to elucidation, while the work of the scribe was simply to reproduce word for word and letter for letter.

tion of the prophets as a whole, till their use in the public worship of the synagogue made it necessary at a comparatively late date. It already existed "in the time of Daniel" (Dan. ix. 2), that is, as may be inferred from a critical opinion cited with apparent approbation on p. 168, the period of the Maccabees. "The Psalter, the hymn-book of the second temple," did not reach its finished form till a still later date, and was added subsequently, together with Job and Proverbs. This is the undisputed portion of the canon, whose authority has always been practically acknowledged, and to which the sanction of the New Testament is given. The remainder of the Hagiographa is the region of the *antilegomena*, books whose authority was more or less contested, but which gradually worked their way to canonical recognition, though the full and final settlement in their favor was not reached till the end of the first Christian century. And he thinks it matter of thankfulness that the determination of the canon was not made sooner, or "the principles of the scribes and Pharisees" would have led to a most unsatisfactory result.

It will not be necessary to review the whole course of this discussion. It is enough to refer to one outstanding fact, which cannot be set aside. The express testimony of Josephus assures us that the twenty-two books of the Jewish canon, which are universally admitted to be identical with the present Hebrew Bible, constituted a determinate body of writings "justly believed to be divine," and which had been for ages sundered from all other books and ranked above them. This statement of Josephus, whatever question may be raised about its accuracy in details, unquestionably represents the current belief of his time. And this is utterly inconsistent with a canon still fluctuating during the life of our Lord and His apostles. The Scriptures to which they make their appeal, were the Old Testament as we now have it, as well defined and settled as it is at present. The case is no more affected by the disputes in Jewish schools, than the canonicity of the Epistle of James is shaken by the doubts expressed by Luther. These casuistical questionings, or as they might rather for the most part be called, these contests of rabbinical subtlety did not touch the historical basis on which the canon rested. And such as they were, they were directed not merely against "Esther, Canticles and Ecclesiastes," but as Prof. Smith has to allow, against what he calls the undisputed portion of the canon likewise, *e.g.* Ezekiel, p. 410, and Proverbs, p. 176. And the omission of Esther from the catalogue of Melito in the second century, and from those of Athanasius and Gregory Nazianzen in the fourth, certainly lends no support to the Professor's view: for on his own showing the canon was then settled and Esther was in it.

The most significant discussion in the volume before us, however, and that for which all that preceded was designed to pave the way, is that concerning the constitution and date of the Pentateuch. This cannot be considered at the close of a notice already sufficiently extended, but must be postponed for a separate article in a future number of this journal.

In conclusion, we are compelled to say that the Professor with all his brilliancy and learning seems to be deficient in well-balanced judgment. How easily he is misled by the *ignis fatuus* of novel and ingenious speculations conspicuously appears from his adoption of the whimsical conceit that Jehovah means "*he who causes rain or lightning to fall upon the earth*" (p. 423). This is not only giving the preference to a rare and somewhat doubtful meaning of the verbal root, above that which it uniformly has everywhere except in a single poetical passage (Job xxxvii. 6); and a meaning which, if allowed, contains in itself no special reference to rain or lightning, but would more naturally, when other derivations are taken into the account, suggest the sense "*He who causes to fall to destruction and ruin,*" *i.e.*, the destroyer; but it involves an amazing lack of apprehension of what is really characteristic of the religion of Israel, to imagine that the one name of God, in which

this religion reaches its highest expression of the object of worship, could possibly mean nothing more than the giver of rain. If the profound meaning sanctioned Ex. iii. 14, and adopted by the best philologists, was to be discredited at all hazards, the suggestion of Kuenen and others, "*He who causes to be*," *i.e.*, the Creator, would have vastly more in its favor. And if a crude notion of the deity was perforce to be wrung out of the Israelitish conception, there would be more plausibility in the allegation, baseless as it is, that light and fire, which are such frequent emblems of the divine being or attributes, gave shape to their earliest thoughts of the Most High, than that they thought of Him simply as the one who made it rain.

W. H. GREEN.

ORIENTALIA. Von PAUL DE LAGARDE. Zweites Heft. (Aus dem sechsundzwanzigsten Bande der Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen). Göttingen, 1880. 4to, 64 pp. B. Westermann & Co., New York.

Lagarde's learning, his critical position, and the peculiarities of his temper, are tolerably well known to all who have occasion to make a special study of the Old Testament. The reviewer may consider his work done, as far as these are concerned, by this brief allusion, and devote his space to some account of the contents of the book in hand.

It consists of two parts. The first is a study of twelve Hebrew words whose meaning or derivation is obscure. The dialects, the versions (including the Coptic), and the Fathers, are all laid under contribution. The general effect is of too heavy a mass of material, though many particulars are of great interest. The second word discussed is אֵל, and the author endeavors to derive it from אֵלֶּה rather than אֵל. The existence of the form in Assyrian, Phœnician, and Hameritic (with the pronunciation *il*) is first established, and the fact that it is not original in Arabic or Aramaic. The improbability of a derivation from אֵלֶּה or אֵלֶּי is then considered. Words of the same form from אֵל roots are brought forward. The conclusion that אֵל is from such a root is rendered probable by this line of argumentation. Whether the author's conjecture as to the meaning of אֵל ("the one towards whom we aspire"), is equally successfully, may be doubted. The largest amount of space in the essay is devoted to the words הָלַל and הוֹדָה, which are treated together. Under them the author gives his theory of the compilation of the Psalter. He thinks it impossible to regard the book as an accidental aggregate of hymns. He believes the division into five books to have been made by the compiler, "since no one will suppose that a later editor had authority enough to make the closing formulas [doxologies] (Ps. xli. 14, lxxii. 19, etc.) part of the sacred text. This, however, they already were for the Greek translators and (so far as the fourth book is concerned) for the author of 1 Chron. xvi. 36." From the varying use of the names יְהוָה and אֱלֹהִים, we see that the five parts "cannot have been originally five separate hymn-books." All the phenomena are best explained by the hypothesis that the five parts were arranged for five different portions of divine service. Psalms that are repeated in different books would not have been suffered to stand thus, unless they served a well-known purpose. This purpose can only have been "to provide for different days of the ecclesiastical year the psalm then to be used in the most appropriate form." He who would understand the Psalter must, therefore, have some conception of the ritual of the second temple. There follows an examination of the passages Lev. xxvii. ; 2 Chron. v. 12 *sq.*, etc., by which the author establishes the fact that הוֹדָה is properly the act of the Levites, who use musical instruments, while הָלַל is used of the priests, whose instrument are trumpets (תְּצוּצְרוֹת). From Num. x. it is evident that these were used to give signals rather than to make music. From the dialects it appears that הָלַל is a cry—opposed to קָנָה, and therefore appropriately used of the shout raised by the people when the

trumpets should give the signal. Further conjectures concerning the Levites need not be detailed here. Among the other words noticed is יהודה, which Lagarde makes a causative, and שרק, which he conjectures to be the original of σόρυξ.

A commentary of Ephraem Syrus, published in Armenian at Venice (1836), is the occasion of the second part of this work. It seems that Ephraem had consulted a Jew when he did not understand the text, and gives his opinion in a number of cases. We have, therefore, an independent witness to early Jewish tradition. Lagarde here gives (waiving the question of the genuineness of the Armenian translation of Ephraem) the more noticeable instances of this tradition found within the first thirty-eight chapters of Genesis. בדרלח (Gen. ii. 72) is rendered *pearls*. To Gen. xxxvi. 24 Ephraem remarks: "Instead of saying *he found a spring of water as he pastured the mules*, the Jew says *he found giants in the desert*, there are no mules." Our text is מֵצָא אֶת הַיָּמִים. Lagarde suggests that the Jew read אֵימִים. For שדה (Gen. xxiv. 63), the Jew gives *standing in prayer*. The Jew makes of כְּתֹנֶת פָּסִים (Gen. xxxvii. 3), a *many-colored garment*, like our own version. These are the only cases of interest to the ordinary student. Doubtless one who had given attention to Armenian would find many others.

H. P. SMITH.

THE BOOK OF JUDGES. By G. C. M. DOUGLASS, D.D., Principal of the Free Church College, Glasgow. 8vo, pp. 96. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Scribner & Welford, New York. 80 cents.

This is one of the hand-books for Bible-classes, edited by the Rev. Drs. Marcus Dodds and Alex. Whyte; a series admirable in conception, and so far as published, well executed. This brief Commentary on one of the most difficult books of the Old Testament is clear, concise, giving the results rather than the processes of exegesis, conservative in tone, yet without any anxiety as to the results of criticism, showing familiarity with his subject and original investigation in the study of the original text. We cannot but regret, therefore, that the work should be marred by an ineffectual effort to explain away the sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter, and the praise of the heroic, but terrible deed of Jael, by a mistranslation of Judges v. 24; which show the author's failure to apprehend the low ethical sense of the period of the Judges in the development of Biblical Ethics.

C. A. BRIGGS.

THE BIBLICAL MUSEUM: A Collection of Notes Explanatory, Homiletic, and Illustrative, on the Holy Scriptures. Especially designed for the use of Ministers, Bible-students, and Sunday-school Teachers. By JAMES COMPER GRAY. Old Testament, Vol. VI., containing the Book of Psalms; Vol. VII., containing Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. 1881.

The increase of homiletical periodicals and books is not altogether a matter for congratulation. No doubt it shows an increased interest in sermonizing. Yet it may also show a desire to have a system of "sermonizing made easy," and such a desire would reasonably cause apprehension. That sermon only can be effective which has been thoroughly wrought out in the head and heart of the preacher. The study of other men's methods is helpful, of course, and this will include the study of other men's sermons as published. But it may be questioned whether the use of published *skeletons*, as they are called, is a means to the construction of good sermons.

The books before us in so far as they are homiletical and especially designed for the use of ministers—both which they profess to be on their title-page—belong to the class of aids just alluded to. They contain brief notes explanatory of the text. At intervals—on almost every page—are given what look like plans for sermons or may be made to serve as such. Opening one of the volumes at random, we find this (on Prov. vii. 1-4): "*Love to the Holy Scriptures*. Show I. The respect we

should pay to the counsels of Divine wisdom. (1) They should be treasured up with diligence. (2) They should be watched over with care. (3) They should be kept ready for use. (4) They should be guarded with tenderest affection. II. The benefits which we shall derive from a due attention to them. (1) We shall be delivered from evil. (2) We shall be carried forward in safety to everlasting life." The words in italics announce the subject for a discourse, and the divisions are the various things which we are directed so peremptorily to *show*. Immediately in connection with each plan is given an illustrative selection, usually an anecdote, also available for homiletical use. These three parts—commentary, skeleton, and illustration—occupy the body of the page. In the margin are given in addition quotations and references designed to throw light upon the text. These are very numerous and taken from a wide range. All the more prominent modern commentators and preachers are laid under contribution, besides some that could hardly be classed under that rubric. Two successive pages give us the following list of authors quoted from or referred to: Jennings and Lowe, Wordsworth (the Bishop), Seneca, R. Cecil, Massillon, D. Wilcox, G. Sutton, S. Lavington, C. Bradley, Hupfeld, Delitzsch, H. Greeves, T. Halyburton, and the "Speaker's Commentary." It would be idle to withhold from the author the praise due untiring industry. Judgment, however, is of as much use in compilation as industry, and some of the selections given might have been spared—as the one which tells of the "colored American Presbyterian deacon," who during the taking of the collection used to sing, "Fly abroad, thou mighty Gospel!" but who at the same time had his eyes shut so tightly as not to see the basket. Newspaper *factiæ* of this class are easily procured from other sources.

If we are asked to judge these volumes as a commentary apart from their homiletical use, we must ask ourselves what aim the commentator should have. Bearing in mind that the commentary is for the English reader rather than for the scholar, we should say—the author ought to aim to explain the meaning of the text with as few words as possible. To this end all display of learning should be avoided, for such display only confuses. It seems to us worse than useless to give such a note as we find at the very beginning of the volume on Psalms: "*Blessed*, literally, *Oh, the happiness*." How much wiser will the English reader be after reading this note?—wiser we mean as to the real thought in the verse. So in Ps. xix. 5 we are told that *chamber* is in Hebrew *chuppah*. To throw light on the title of Ps. xxii. we have quoted for us a description of a Persian work, entitled "The Gulzar-e-Saadet; or, Rose-bud of Prosperity," with an additional remark on the *covers* of Persian books! The whole is entirely irrelevant, the present titles of the Psalms having no resemblance to the high-flown titles of Oriental books.

A commentary should not seek to explain what is already clear. When we read that he that gathereth in harvest is a wise son, we rather resent it to have the commentator put in "*gathereth*, the ripened harvest into threshing-floor or barn." To *know* is doubtless to *become acquainted with*, but any one who can read does not need to be told so. Notes that explain *ungodly* by *wicked*; *planted* (Ps. i. 3) by *fixed, settled*; *abide* by *sojourn*; *integrity* by *conscious sincerity of intention*—such notes only add to the bulk of a book without increasing its usefulness. In cases where there is obscurity in the English translation it would seem better to give a new translation of the whole verse—or of more than one verse—than to explain the obscure word alone. Where the obscurity is in the Hebrew the proper plan would seem to be, first to say that the passage in question is obscure, and then to give the most probable meaning by translation or paraphrase, basing all subsequent references to the passage upon that translation. A conspicuous example of the wrong method may be found in the book before us—at the confessedly obscure Ps. xvi. 2-4. Here we have the best translation of verse 2 with Delitzsch's paraphrase in the margin. Then follows on verse 3—"but, omit this word and add *I say* after the

word delight. The Psalmist is about to make a testimony of his convictions." It would surely have been better to make a new translation and print it, than to puzzle the reader in this way. Especial care should be used also to make the language of the notes perfectly clear. In one instance at least in these books it is not so—Ps. xiv. 1—"heart, not in intellect, but in the seat of thought and conviction." If the intellect be not the seat of thought, we have studied the usage of our language to small profit. In fact, the heart is in the Old Testament the seat of the intellect, and so of thought and conviction.

The specimen faults we have given above are not all we have noticed in our examination of these two volumes. Some may think the criticisms too severe for books which do not make any great pretensions. There is, however, need of as high quality of work in a popular commentary as in any other book. It needs a very different sort of book from the one before us to give an edifying knowledge of the Word of God. We cannot close this notice without mentioning the curious exigency which caused the bookbinder to make the cover-title of Vol. VII. read: *Proverbs to Solomon*, instead of *Proverbs to Solomon's Song*.

HENRY P. SMITH.

COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. By F. GODET, D.D. Translated from the French by the Rev. A. CUSIN, M.A. Vol. II., pp. 434. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Scribner & Welford, New York.

The first volume of this work received favorable notice in this REVIEW, Vol. I., p. 377, and II., p. 191. The second volume, beginning with chapter vii., completes the work. The author's exposition and discussion of chapters vii. and viii. illustrate how fully he represents and deals with contemporary Biblical investigation and religious controversy as they have to do with this epistle. Mr. Pearsall Smith is among the authors reviewed. The author's view of these chapters is, that the whole of chapter vii. refers to Paul's state as a Pharisee, while chapter viii. describes the state of regenerate Christians. The study of chapter vii. in detail shows that

"Paul has avoided, with evident design, every expression especially belonging to the Christian sphere, and the term *the spirit* in particular, to make use only of terms denoting the natural faculties of the human soul, like that of *the mind*. The contrast in this respect with viii. 1-11 is striking. We can thus understand why this is the passage in all Paul's epistles which presents the most points of contact with profane literature" (p. 53).

A foot-note cites some impressive parallels.

While in this and other elaborations, purely exegetical, we admiringly follow our author as a skilful teacher, we do not feel the same confidence in his theological elaborations. For instance, on vii. 24, he raises the question: "Why does Paul here call himself *wretched* rather than guilty?" (p. 47) and proceeds to reply:

"Because the point in question is not the condemnation resulting from guilt; this subject was treated in the first part, chapters i.-v. The innate power of evil, against which that of the law is shattered, is a hereditary disease, a misfortune which only becomes a fault in proportion as we consent to it personally by not struggling against it with the aids appropriate to the economy in which we live" (pp. 47, 48).

It is sin that makes the wretchedness which Paul expresses. The wretchedness was his own because the sin was so, and thus the guilt. As Dr. Charles Hodge expresses it: "The burden of indwelling sin was a load which Paul could neither cast off nor bear." The question proposed above is an over-refinement for which there is no occasion, except to pave the way for the distinction the author would make.

We may here express ourselves regarding the author's view of Expiation given in Vol. I. in an excursus at chapter iii. 25, 26. He compares Paul's conception of Redemption, as he comprehends it, "with the doctrine generally received in the Church," and finds the difference as follows:

"In that ecclesiastical theory God claims the punishment of Christ for His own satisfaction, as far as His justice ought to obtain an equivalent of the punishment merited by man, to permit divine love to par-

don. From the view-point where the apostle's exposition puts us, that equivalent is only destined to *satisfy* divine justice in *manifesting* it and in *re-establishing* thus the normal relation between God and the guilty creature." "The attribute of *justice* (the fixed resolution to keep order) that exists latent in the divine *holiness*, must, therefore, appear as a necessary safeguard as soon as liberty rises to notice and with it the possibility of disorder; and that attribute must remain in exercise as long as the educative period of the life of the creatures lasts, that is to say, until they have arrived at perfection in love."

What is here represented as Paul's conception does not appear essentially different from the Governmental Theory of the Atonement. Only, instead of "the good of the universe," the author defines further: "The *good* is order, the normal relation among all free beings from God Himself to the last of them" (in iii. 25). We see no gain in this difference. The sufferings and death of the Son of God to demonstrate the fixed determination of God to keep order in the relations of free beings, *z. e.*, between Himself and men, is a conception, not only inferior to what Paul expresses, but in itself insufferably flat.

S. T. LOWRIE.

THE LAND OF GILEAD: WITH EXCURSIONS IN LEBANON. By LAURENCE OLIPHANT, author of "Lord Elgin's Mission to China," "Piccadilly," etc. With Maps and Illustrations. Large 12mo, pp. 430. Price, \$2. New York: Appleton & Co., 1881.

This a well-written exposition, by an experienced author, of the results of his extensive journeys and thorough observations in the part of ancient Palestine lying east of the Jordan, the ancient Gilead. He presents us with a full and reliable description of the country, its natural productions, of all classes of its inhabitants, and their social customs and religious faith and observances.

The object of Mr. Oliphant in these investigations and in this instructive account of them, is to promote, for purely political interests, the establishment in that region of a colony of native and foreign Jews;—this colony to be the type of a series of local communities, subject to the supreme control of the Imperial Government at Constantinople, but endowed with a certain measure of self-government, with provincial councils, popularly elected under governors-general, immovable for a term of years. A process of decentralization of this kind he thinks to be an absolutely essential condition of preserving for long the integrity of the Turkish Empire; and that "the two provinces in Asia which most urgently stand in need of a measure of this description are Armenia and Syria." Mr. Oliphant believes that these provinces must be preserved to that Empire in order to prevent the ambitious designs of Russia, and maintain for England an open highway through Syria and Egypt to her Indian dependencies. And he believes that their adherence to the Turkish Empire depends upon their being endowed with a relative independence, and with a larger measure of popular control.

His enterprise failed to secure the necessary support of the Turkish Government, but the book remains, and will well reward perusal.

A. A. HODGE.

II.—HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

THE ORIGIN OF NATIONS. By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A., Camden Professor of Ancient History, Oxford, and Canon of Canterbury. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1881.

Twenty years ago, in a volume of Essays entitled "Aids to Faith," and intended to be an answer to the celebrated "Essays and Reviews," Prof. Rawlinson published a paper on the "Genuineness and Authenticity of the Pentateuch," and summed up his views in the closing sentence in the following words: "There is really not a pretence for saying that recent discoveries in the field of history, monumental or other, have made the acceptance of the Mosaic narrative in its plain and literal sense any more difficult now than in the days of Bossuet or Stillingfleet." For a score of years the learned Professor has stood as godfather to that assertion

and has defended it right manfully. In reply to objections and attacks, he contributed a series of papers to "The Leisure Hour," and at the instance of the Committee of the Religious Tract Society, these papers were collected and revised by the author, and published by that society. This volume has been republished in this country.

The work consists of two parts: 1. On Ancient Civilization. 2. On Ethnic Affinities, etc. Of all the arguments adduced against his position only two seemed to the author to require an answer. "One based itself on the supposed historical certainty of a settled monarchy having existed in Egypt from at least B.C. 5000." "The other was more general. It asserted the very early existence of civilization in various parts of the world; and assuming the unproved hypothesis, that man was originally an absolute savage, it required our acceptance of the belief that some such space as a hundred thousand years must have elapsed from the first beginning of man to his development into his present civilized condition. The Essays on Civilization are directed against these two lines of reasoning."

The flippant and presumptuous theories concerning Pre-historic Man as a savage which are rife in our day are utterly unsupported by historical testimony. Egyptology gives us no hint or suggestion of an original barbarism. The earliest glimpses which we gain of that country reveal a high state of civilization. This is also true of Babylon. The author cites facts to prove that civilization is quite as apt to deteriorate as to improve; and he might have added that no instance has been adduced wherein a race has raised itself from savagery to civilization without aid from civilized races. After a calm and careful review of the facts as bearing upon the antiquity of civilization in Egypt, Babylon, Asia Minor, Central Asia, and Phœnicia it is found as a result that "a *consensus of savants* and scholars almost unparalleled limits the past history of civilized man, to a date removed from our own time by less than 4,400 years *excepting in a single instance*." This single exception occurs in the case of Egypt, in regard to the antiquity of whose civilization the most eminent Egyptologists vary in their estimates to the extent of twenty-three centuries; this being the amount of variation between Mariette and Sir G. Wilkinson; the intermediate space between these extremes being covered by the various estimates of Brugsch, Lepsius, Bunsen, and Stuart Poole. The causes of this diversity in chronological estimates are mainly two: *First*, The Egyptians had no era, no system of chronology, no chronological idea, and as Mariette says, "*never had any chronology at all*." An Egyptian chronology cannot be constructed from the monuments. The other source of information on the subject is found in the lists of kings as given by Manetho, and here emerges the *second* cause of diversity in chronological estimates. "The question which alone divides historical critics, and which produces the existing diversity of opinion with respect to the duration of Egyptian civilization, is simply this: Were the dynasties of Manetho continuous or were any of them contemporary?" All Egyptologists, with the single exception of M. Mariette, admit contemporaneity of some of Manetho's dynasties. The extent of this contemporaneity, however, remains an uncertain element. Prof. Rawlinson places the "establishment of a settled monarchy in Egypt and with it of civilization between B.C. 2450 and B.C. 2250." According to this view, the civilization in Egypt synchronizes substantially with the civilization of Babylon, the ablest cuneiform scholars placing the beginnings of Babylon about B.C. 2300. But if the "long chronology" be adopted, then we have as a result this anomalous state of things, viz: that Egypt as a civilized nation stood alone in the midst of the nations for a period of twenty centuries without communicating that civilization to her neighbors. Is this probable? Is it credible?

The second part of the work on "Ethnic Affinities in the Ancient World," is really a commentary on the tenth chapter of Genesis, and is a vindication of the scientific accuracy of Biblical ethnology. In brief but most interesting essays on

the Japhetic, the Hamitic, and the Semitic races in their main and subordinate divisions, the distinguished author reads the tenth chapter of Genesis in the best light of modern ethnological science, and reaches the following conclusion: "In no respect is there any contradiction between the teaching of the modern science of ethnology and this venerable record. On the contrary, the record, rightly interpreted, completely harmonizes with the science, and not only so, *but even anticipates many of the most curious and remarkable of the discoveries which ethnology has made in comparatively recent times.*" The fact that the ethnology of Genesis is not only accurate, but that it anticipates many of the discoveries of modern science, receives some striking illustrations. The tenth chapter of Genesis brings together as members of the same family races which are apparently the most diverse. "There was a time," says Max Müller, "when the ancestors of the Celts, the Germans, the Slaves, the Greeks and Italians, the Persians and Hindoos, were living together beneath the same roof separate from the Semitic and Turanian races." This is precisely the teaching of the Bible; and was the teaching of the Bible ages before ethnology was a science. It has been supposed to be a mistake to assign Southern and South-eastern Arabia originally to the Cushites as Gen. x. 7 does. Philologists have been in the habit of speaking of the Arabians as being Semites; but modern researches have shown that from a very remote period there have been at least two races in Arabia: one Semitic, and the other Ethiopian or Cushite. "The Mosaic genealogist," says Rawlinson, "is in this instance strikingly confirmed by ethnological science on a point where his statements seemed most open to attack."

It has long been considered a mistake to suppose that Cushites founded the original kingdom of Babylon, as Gen. x. 8-10 asserts. "Nimrod," said Baron Bunsen, "was no Cushite. Indeed an Asiatic Ethiopia was a pure figment of Biblical interpreters; it existed only in their imaginations, and was the child of their despair." But through the discoveries and decipherings of Sir Henry Rawlinson, it has been proved beyond all question, that Cushites founded the kingdom of Babylon just as the record of Genesis asserts. That the first Babylonian kingdom was Cushite has become a commonplace in Ancient history.

The opinion was once universal, that Egyptian civilization descended the Nile; but according to the ethnography of the Bible, the Egyptians came from Asia by way of the Syrian desert. The direction in which Egyptian civilization traveled, is exactly the reverse of that which it was supposed to have been. Thus has modern science demonstrated not only the accuracy of the ethnology of Genesis, but has shown that the Bible anticipated some of the most curious discoveries of modern times. The ablest scholars, critics, and archæologists place the Pentateuch as an authority side by side with the monuments of Egypt and Babylon.

This little book by Prof. Rawlinson puts in popular form some of the results of modern science, as these results shed light upon the Biblical record, or as the Biblical record sheds light upon them.

S. J. WILSON.

EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE PRIMERS. Edited by Prof. GEORGE P. FISHER, D.D. The Fathers of the Third Century. By Rev. GEORGE A. JACKSON. D. Appleton & Co., New York.

This is the second in a series of little volumes designed, as stated by the editor, "to provide intelligent persons, laymen as well as ministers, with the means of acquainting themselves, through accurate translations or summaries, with the early ecclesiastical writers." A former volume treated of the Apostolic Fathers and the Primitive Apologists; this treats of the Christian writings of the third century. The method pursued is to give, first, a general view of the Church and its relations to the world in the period designated, followed by a similar account of its Christian literature. Its most important authors are then presented chronologically, and,

under the head of each, the demand of the times calling forth his works and what he wrote. A condensed summary is then given of his most important work, with extracts from it, or, if it is brief, a careful translation of the whole. In this volume an introduction on the progress of Christianity in the third century, is followed by an account of the Greek Christian writers of the time, consisting of an article on Irenæus, a condensed summary of his work against heresies, with suitable extracts, and fragments of two epistles. Similarly presented are the lives and writings of Hippolytus, of Clement of Alexandria, of Origen, of Gregory Thaumaturgus, and of some less known. The rise of Christian literature in Latin is then recounted, with the life and works of Tertullian, of Cyprian, and other Latin authors, after the same manner.

These volumes though small are not superficial. A man whose life is too crowded with work for more prolonged reading, can get from them, in a few minutes, information to impress him with the sense of an addition to his best thinking. Comprehensive and compact in statement, they are executed from the view-point of a mind fully master of the subject, with a firm, classical finish. JAMES C. MOFFAT.

NEUESTE DOGMENGESCHICHTE (von Semler bis zum Gegenwart), Vorlesungen von Dr. Maximilian Albert Landerer, weil. Professor der Theologie in Tübingen. Heilbronn, 1881. B. Westermann & Co., N. Y.

The name of Dr. M. A. Landerer, late Professor of Theology in the University of Tübingen, is much less known in this country than those of many of his contemporaries in the German schools. This is due to his marked reserve in coming before the public with the results of his studies; in which he differed greatly, as well as in other respects, from his fellow-professor Ferd. Christian Baur; and indeed from most of the German literati. He was singularly modest in his nature and sparing and infrequent in venturing into print; a reticence which, what we have left from him, is calculated to make us deeply regret. His most important contribution to theological science is this "*Latest Doctrinal History*"; a work of moderate proportions, and left incomplete at his death; but of the highest merit and value in its line. The firm and clear touch of a master hand is seen from the beginning to the end of it.

The precise section of dogmatic history to which Prof. Landerer devotes himself, is the period of a hundred years before his own time, which includes the whole development of German rationalism in its growth, blossoming, and decay.

The furious controversies in the Churches of the Reformation, involving, just as at other times, the extinction of vital piety, and winding up in a rigid and intolerant confessional orthodoxy, prepared the way, by the middle of the eighteenth century, for a general reaction against Christianity and the Church, assuming various forms of unbelief in England, Italy, France, and Germany. In the latter, it took that shape of elaborate assault on the authenticity and genuineness of the Scriptures which, ranging from the vague sentimental Pelagianism of Jacobi, to the deadly hatred of Strauss, is known by the name of rationalism. Landerer begins with the father of this whole system, John Salomon Semler, whose arbitrary dealing with revelation was the revolt of his nature against the narrow and dogmatic pietism in which he had been brought up. Following him, German Protestantism passed through a great revolution, in the course of which not merely the old rigid orthodox conception of Scripture was discarded, but Christianity was stripped of one supernatural feature after another, till nothing was left of a belief in God, or human responsibility, or immortality, except so much as the reason itself could spontaneously evolve.

In tracing this history, we descend through various forms of "semi-rationalism" and "empirical rationalism," till we are landed in the "frivolous rationalism," or vulgar mocking infidelity, of Reimar (Wolfenbüttel fragments) and Bahrdt. Then

comes the counter revolution originated by Kant and perfected by Hegel, in which the sceptre was wrested from the hands of rationalism, though it continued for some decades longer to sit as a crowned ghost on the throne of theological opinion. The too merely negative system of the Königsberg philosopher set up nothing substantial enough to push it from its seat.

This was left for the "rationalistic-biblical" followers of Kant, who standing on the ruins of the rationalistic positions he had demolished, proceeded to restore the supernatural element in German Christianity. The leaders in this revival of doctrine were Gottlob Christian Storr and the brothers J. F. and C. C. Flatt, Professors at Tübingen at the close of the last century; followed by others who, like Schott and Knapp, gave the movement something more the character of a revival of religion. This brings us to the close of the "first stadium" of Landerer's history, which nearly corresponds chronologically to the opening of the present century.

The second stadium extends from the second decade of the century to the author's own time; and includes the history of German orthodoxy in its restoration, its negation, and its reform; beginning with Hengstenberg and ending with Schleiermacher and his school. Among the numerous figures which pass over the stage in this drama, the most significant are the first and last named, Semler and Schleiermacher; of whom the one resolved all religion into reason, and the other into feeling. Taken together they furnish the key to the whole past and present condition of Theology in Germany.

Though not personally a scholar of Schleiermacher, Prof. Landerer represents the best section of his school, and both in this history and in a separate monograph, has shown a peculiar interest in the portraiture of Schleiermacher's system. A more satisfactory exhibition of that most productive philosophy of religion can nowhere be found, than is given in a few pages of this history. That great, but ill-proportioned and unstably-balanced figure stands out here, reflecting a brilliant light on one side, and casting a baleful shadow on the other, over all theological thought in Germany; an object to admire and to fear. It has been the fate of many of the most fruitful minds in the departments of Philosophy and Theology, from Origen down, to develop ideas which worked themselves out in opposite directions, and furnished the platforms for antagonistic parties. The many-sided activity of Schleiermacher subjected him especially to this necessity; so that, apart from the immense stimulus he gave to theological speculation, it must remain, so far, doubtful, whether the good he wrought by rehabilitating religious sentiment, is not more than counterbalanced by his associating with it an utter indifference to positive dogma. The personal and religious beauty of Schleiermacher's own character would be, in the view of some, only an aggravation of the mischiefs of his teaching. Such was not the feeling, however, of Dr. Charles Hodge. It is as honorable to the Christian charity, as it is to the courage, of that eminent divine that he does not hesitate to express the belief, that this universal doctrinal heretic, this anti-Trinitarian and Pantheist, but whose heart was as the heart of a little child, and whose whole theology centered in the love of Christ, is now "singing the praises of Christ in heaven." We also believe the strain is swelled something higher, since the voice of CHARLES HODGE has been added to the chorus: *Multae terricolis lingue, celestibus una.*

Prof. Landerer's treatment of his subject is in a method of fine art not often found among German historical writers. His keen discriminating judgments are clothed in a style so trenchant, as to rise occasionally to the attribute of wit; in which indeed Landerer was by no means deficient. With the utmost modesty and gentleness of personal character, his sense of literary integrity made him an unsparing critic. His judgments upon even some of his contemporaries are expressed with a freedom bordering on severity. The true problem of dogmatic history he had him-

self elucidated in his earlier academic addresses ; and the arrangement of this work shows how fully he had grasped and mastered the methodology of the subject.

The circumstance already referred to, of the comparative unfamiliarity of American readers with Prof. Landerer, will excuse us for adding a brief biographical sketch. We are aided in this by the kindness of Prof. Weizsäcker, from whom the writer has received a copy of the addresses made at the funeral of his former associate, as also his own personal tribute of admiration and regard. Maximilian Albert Landerer was born at Maulbronn, in Württemberg, on the 14th of January, 1810. His early education was under his father, who was a professor in that place, but who, in 1818, was transferred to the parish of Waldorf, near Tübingen. The son's further training was carried on in that city, where he devoted himself at an early age to the study of theology. In 1832 he passed his first examination, and was made Vicar of Waldorf Parish, which was much too extended for his father's strength. He continued to prosecute his theological studies with enthusiasm, visiting several universities, and particularly attending at Berlin on the lectures of Twisten and Steffens. In 1835 he became a "repetent" at Tübingen ; in 1841 Professor of Theology Extraordinary ; and the year following a regular member of the Theological Faculty. In this position he continued laboring with quiet but intense devotion, and receiving frequent marks of public appreciation, till increasing deafness and a serious injury caused by an accident, obliged him in 1877 to retire on the pension attached to the professorship. The failure of his health was attended with acute suffering, which he bore with cheerful Christian submission ; and he died suddenly on the 13th of April, 1878.

The character of Prof. Landerer seems to have endeared him greatly to all who knew him. He was a devout Christian man ; and in all his relations to the Church and the university, to his family and friends, exhibited a model of simple, genial piety. Though intensely devoted to study, he was far from anything like ascetic severity ; but found his recreation and delight in the cheerful conversation and amusements of the home circle. He possessed a strong sense of humor which shed a charm over all his intercourse. The modesty which prevented him, notwithstanding frequent solicitations, from giving the public the benefit of his studies, has been already referred to. A volume of his sermons has been collected and published since his death, which the writer has not seen. But Landerer, after entering on his duties at Tübingen, could seldom be persuaded to enter the pulpit. He proceeded on the somewhat eccentric view that the university which employed and salaried him was entitled to his entire strength ; and that he had no right to diffuse himself in extraneous labor. He supplied valuable articles for Herzog's *Realencyclopædie* and other magazines ; but the *NEUESTE DOGMENGESCHICHTE* remains the only solid monument of his brilliant intellectual gifts and his large and accurate learning. He continued extending and revising this work to the very last ; so that we have here the judgments of an eminently competent critic of German Theology, down to within three or four years of the present time. SAMUEL M. HOPKINS.

ST. GILES' LECTURES. First Series. The Scottish Church from the Earliest Times to 1881, to which is prefixed an Historical Sketch of St. Giles' Cathedral. By W. CHAMBERS, LL.D. 8vo., pp. lxiv., 384. Edinburgh : W. & R. Chambers. 1881.
A DISCOURSE ON SCOTTISH CHURCH HISTORY FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE PRESENT TIME, with Prefatory Remarks on the St. Giles' Lectures, and Appendix of Notes and References. By CHARLES WORDSWORTH, D.C.L. 8vo, pp. 106. Edinburgh : William Blackwood & Sons. New York : Scribner & Welford.

It is appropriate that the renovation and restoration of the chief cathedral church of Scotland should be accompanied with a series of lectures upon Scottish Church History. The historic spirit will naturally display itself in a revived attention to the historical monuments as well as in the lecture and the learned treatise. The introductory account of the work that has been done in the restoration of St. Giles' to its

primitive majesty and beauty, encourages us to hope that the work will speedily be carried on to its completion, and that other gentlemen, cities, and towns of Scotland will take their share in the task of restoration, so that if it may not be able to present to the student, the traveller, and the people such great masterpieces of architectural grace and beauty as the sister kingdom of England, it may still make a wise use of such masterpieces as are in its possession.

The Lectures are twelve in number, by eminent divines of the Established Church of Scotland, as follows: (1) *Heathen Scotland*, by the Rev. James Cameron Lees, D.D.; (2) *Early Christian Scotland*, by the Rev. A. K. H. Boyd, D.D.; (3) *Mediæval Scotland*, by the Rev. James Campbell, D.D.; (4) *Pre-Reformation Scotland*, by the Rev. Prof. Alex. F. Mitchell, D.D.; (5) *The Reformation*, by the Rev. Donald Macleod, D.D.; (6) *Episcopacy, Presbytery, and Puritanism in Scotland*, by the Rev. John Cunningham, D.D.; (7) *The Covenant*, by the Rev. Prof. Robert Flint, D.D., LL.D.; (8) *The Revolution Settlement*, by the Rev. Robert H. Story, D.D.; (9) *The Church of the 18th Century*, by the Rev. Principal John Tulloch, D.D., LL.D.; (10) *The Church of the 19th Century*, by the Rev. Prof. A. H. Charteris, D.D.; (11) *The Church from 1843 to 1881*, by the Rev. Archibald Scott, D.D.; (12) *The Church of the Present Day*, by the Rev. James Macgregor, D.D.

These Lectures covering so much ground in brief compass and in a popular form differ greatly in intrinsic value, in scholarly research and judgment, and in historic sense and expression, as indeed we might judge at the outset in glancing over the well-known names of the lecturers. As a whole, the aim of the course has been kept steadily in view, the interest is sustained, and the treatment is as full as could reasonably be expected, and with a broad, generous unsectarian spirit that wins the commendation and admiration of the unbiased reader. The point of view is necessarily that of the Established Church of Scotland, and therefore the various separating Churches are not treated as fully as we could wish; yet we do not think that any less disproportionate treatment could be secured in any other way than by selecting the lecturers from the various Churches, and so combining the various points of view. We cannot but feel that Bishop Wordsworth from his point of view in his remarks upon these lectures, has not improved the situation, although there is some room for his complaint as to the statements of the eighth lecturer, with regard to the Revolution Settlement, a subject which, in itself, might be expected to produce varying judgments. Bishop Wordsworth doubtless has strong reasons for his position that all the Churches of the Reformation would have continued Episcopalian if they had not been thwarted by the tyranny of the Romish Church (p. 34), but he is not authorized by the facts of history to represent the Scottish Church as bearing "the cast-off trappings of the English Puritans, known by the name not of Edinburgh or of Aberdeen—nor of Glasgow or of St. Andrew's—but of Westminster; a phenomenon in the nature of a Nemesis," for their "determination to assimilate England to Scotland by force of arms" (pp. 51 and 52). Nor is he justified in his statement: "We see the teaching of the Old Testament not only set above that of the New, but, through the fanatical misapplication of its lessons and examples, employed to justify principles and actions which rightly understood, it would have been found to condemn" (p. 52). Nor is Prof. Flint justified in saying that "ever since the days of Melville Presbyterian Scotland had been gradually becoming more and more Puritanic" (p. 188). The conflict against the five articles of Perth and the struggle of the Scottish Commissioners with the English Puritans in the Westminster Assembly clearly show that the Presbyterians of Scotland were narrower and more illiberal than the English Puritans in matters of Church Government and Worship. And though the Old Testament received an undue emphasis by the more radical element among the Covenanters and English sectaries, yet it never fairly characterized the Puritans of England or the Presbyterians of Scotland. Indeed, all parties were narrow, illiberal, and exclusive in their peculiar characteristics. The

faults of the age reflected in all parties in common were the claim of divine right for their theories of Church Government, Discipline, and Worship, in their minutest details, and the determination to set up the divine right by force of arms. All suffered alike, each in its turn deservedly for its persecution of others, until the result was attained after awhile of the existence, side by side, in the same nation, of all the parties balancing one another with more or less mutual respect and general good feeling and harmony. Such a toleration and recognition within the Established Churches at the outset might have prevented separation. A future combination and union is only possible by comprehension and not by subjugation, such as is virtually involved in the three principles of Bishop Wordsworth, where *continuity* and *unity* lead up to the *obligation* of *gratitude* to the early bishops (p. 47), and a return of all the Churches to the bosom of the non-established Scottish Episcopal Church and the Established Church of England.

The spirit of the Lectures is irenic and catholic, and they cannot but do good service toward a better understanding between the various Churches of Scotland.

C. A. BRIGGS.

HISTORY OF RELIGION IN ENGLAND: From the Opening of the London Parliament to the End of the Eighteenth Century. By JOHN STOUGHTON, D.D. New and Revised Edition. In six volumes, large 12mo. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1881.

Dr. Stoughton, a prominent member of the Sixth General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance in New York, 1873, has been known over both continents for a quarter of a century as the most eminent minister of the English Independents. He is a loyal Evangelical Congregationalist, true to the history of his party, but of broad sympathies and high culture, eminent chiefly as an elegant writer, and a learned and impartial historian.

As far back as 1867 he published, in two octavo volumes, under the title "Ecclesiastical History of England," the history of the "Church of the Civil Wars." This was followed, in 1870, by two similar volumes, under the same title, on the "Church of the Restoration." The present series adds two more volumes on the "Church of the Revolution" and the "Church of the Georgian Era." All these volumes are here brought together in one harmonious form. "Several minor inaccuracies have been corrected; valuable criticisms, in periodical reviews and private communications, have improved the narrative; unnecessary notes have been expunged, and important matters, before contained in appendices, are embodied in the text."

It is not a history of any particular Church, nor an historical polemic in the interest of any religious party. It is what it claims to be, and, as such, supplies a great desideratum, a "History of Religion in England from 1640 to 1800." Nevertheless it unavoidably is suffused with the animus of the author, as an Independent opposing Presbyterianism as much as Prelacy, and as a nominal moderate Calvinist protesting against "the narrowness and severity of the Calvinism" of the Westminster Assembly.

A. A. HODGE.

UNBELIEF IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY AS CONTRASTED WITH ITS EARLIER AND LATER HISTORY. Cunningham Lecture for 1880. By JOHN CAIRNS, D.D. 8vo, pp. 309. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black. 1881.

The author of this volume has long been recognized as one of the leading thinkers of Great Britain, and as far back as 1865 Professor Masson said of him in his "Recent British Philosophy": "Any man who on any subject of metaphysical speculation should contend with Dr. Cairns of Berwick-upon-Tweed would have reason to know ere he had done with him what strength for offence or defence there may yet be in a Puritan minister's hand-grip." These lectures are historical rather than polemic, and on this account, are not particularly illustrative of the controversial ability to which Professor Masson refers. But they have excellencies of another

kind; and these are to be found in the calm and judicial temper that pervades the volume; in the author's invariable fairness to adversaries; in his thorough mastery of his historical material, together with his judicious selection out of the great mass at his disposal of that which best subserves the purpose indicated in his title-page; in the power to group, generalize, and condense so as to present a sharp and discriminating picture of the period covered by the lectures; and finally, in the power to seize upon the points of forgotten controversies that deserve to be accentuated by reason of the relation they sustain to questions that are under discussion to-day.

The unbelief of the eighteenth century is a familiar theme, and it is high praise to say of any volume coming after "Farrar's Critical History of Free Thought," as we can say of this, that it is a fresh and valuable contribution to this form of apologetic literature.

The aim of the volume secures its individuality; and that is, to exhibit eighteenth century unbelief as compared with periods preceding and following, and to review the religious discussions of a century ago, so as "to show how these debates look in the light of more recent opinion and controversy." If we have any reason to complain, it is that the latter idea is not made more prominent in the volume, and that, holding, perhaps, too closely to the historical conception of his undertaking, the author has been contented to throw out only passing hints, though most suggestive ones, on subjects that invite fuller discussion.

The first lecture is devoted to the differences that separate the unbelief of the first four centuries from that of later, and especially of recent times. The unbelief of the seventeenth century is the subject of the second lecture. Scepticism was abundant enough, no doubt, during all those intervening years; but there were reasons why it attracted little attention and called for little public notice. In the first place, the Church was fighting, during a great deal of the time, against flesh and blood. The Saracen was her foe, and the Crusades, as Dr. Cairns remarks, were "the chief, if not the only, apologetics of many centuries." Then came the period of rupture with Rome, during which "the Reformers were too seriously occupied with their life-and-death battle against corrupted Christianity to think much of unbelief in the abstract." But the era of the Protestant confessions was followed by one of religious declension and of unbelief, by an era that called for defences of the faith against the enemy without, rather than for definitions of the faith indicative of existing differences among Christians themselves. So we have the great prototypes of modern apologetics in the *Pensées* of Pascal and the *de veritate religionis Christianæ* of Grotius. A notice of these followed by a brief account of Lord Herbert, Spinoza, and Bayle, as representing respectively the Deistic, Pantheistic, and Sceptical thought of the century, constitutes the main feature of this lecture. Of sentimental sympathy with Spinoza there is no lack in modern literature, and on this account, as well as because Spinoza, to use Mr. Arnold's phrase, is just now coming to the front, we read with no regret the following reference to his disingenuousness:

"It must ever leave a shade on the memory of Spinoza that he should have sent out a work like that described, adapted all through to the language of ordinary Theism, and even so far of Christian faith, while he had in reserve, and was circulating among his friends, the mature treatise, which, published after his death, by his own instructions, revealed the pantheistic basis of his whole scheme of thought" (p. 56).

There is no apology for this, as his latest biographer and admirer virtually admits, when he says:

"Altogether the difficulty remains considerable. There is an unexplained gap between the rationalizing criticism of the 'Tractatus Theologico-Politicus,' which goes a long way, but refuses to go all lengths, and the thorough-going speculation of the 'Ethics.' Difference of dates will not account for it, since we know that Spinoza's philosophy was matured long before the 'Theologico-Political Treatise' was published" (Pollock's "Spinoza," p. 363).

In a foot-note to the lecture on English Deism, Dr. Cairns refers to the fact that Huxley some years ago "praised the Deistical writers as examples of the strength

of English reasoning." On the contrary, and far more wisely, Leslie Stephen, in his "History of English Thought," speaking as if he would apologize for the disastrous defeat of the Deists, remarks :

"They are but a ragged regiment, whose whole ammunition of learning was a trifle when compared with the abundant stores of a single light of orthodoxy ; whilst in speculative ability most of them were children by the side of their : blest antagonists. . . . It would be difficult to mention a controversy in which there was a greater disparity of force. The physiognomy of the books themselves bears marks of the difference. The deist writings are but shabby and shrivelled little octavos, generally anonymous, such as lurk in the corners of dusty shelves, and seem the predestined prey of moths. Against them are arrayed solid octavos and handsome quartos and even folios—very Goliaths among books, too ponderous for our degenerate days, but fitting representatives of the learned dignitaries who compiled them " (Vol. I., p. 86).

And even a writer like Mr. Hunt seems not unwilling to belittle the victory which was achieved over unbelief by representing that the issue between the apologists and the deists was not what it is commonly understood to be. And he remarks that,

"If we take the deists as sincere in the profession of their belief that Christianity is an authoritative republication of natural religion, there will be, in many cases, but little to choose between them and the Christian apologists " ("Religious Thought in England," Vol. III., p. 389).

One cannot help wishing that such depreciatory references to this great controversy, as those of the writers named, had been especially dealt with, and particularly that the author of these lectures had given us a reasoned and elaborate statement of the issue involved. Indeed, it is a matter of regret restricting the lectures as a whole that finds particular illustration in the lecture of which we speak, that the argumentative element has been reduced to a minimum. The author truly says :

"The whole of this school of apologists, including Conybeare, thus built too much in probability ; instead of holding in addition to miracle and prophecy that new moral truth and light embodied in the person and work of Christ, was a separate and immediate evidence, as Pascal had so grandly maintained, and carried revelation home to all who did not unfairly exclude it."

This, however, suggests an important question regarding the method of Christian apologetics, and while the author is right in saying that probable reasoning and the external evidences should not be relied on exclusively in defence of Christianity, we are sure that he would also say that the work of Paley and Butler is not to be set aside for the subjectivism which some are disposed to substitute for it at the present day. The sentence just quoted is one of a number that arrest attention by reason of their immediate bearing upon current literature, and which are sure of being quoted in the theological debates of the present day. The main topic in the lecture is Deism proper, as illustrated in Collins, Woolston, Tindal, Shaftesbury, Chubb, and Morgan. Hume and Gibbon are treated as representative sceptics of the period, and Toland falls into his proper place in a classification that seems to call for a typical Pantheist, though Toland's vanity was more conspicuous than his Pantheism.

From English Deism to French infidelity the transition is easy, and Voltaire, who came to England when the Deistic controversy was in progress, is the connecting link between the two. The three types of unbelief in France during the eighteenth century are represented by Scepticism, Deism, and Atheism. Whether Voltaire should be regarded as a Deist or a sceptic the author is in doubt ; but his opinion of Rousseau is expressed in more confident terms : "It is, perhaps, not going too far to say that, in a large view, Rousseau (so far as his ultimate creed goes) is a Christian of the school of Channing rather than an Encyclopædist." The Atheistic form of French infidelity, as represented by La Mettrie and Diderot, is dismissed with only passing mention, and the lecture closes eloquently by contrasting the condition of France with that of England in the ability of the clergy to deal with the assaults upon the Christian faith.

"Never," he says, "did any great corporate body exhibit such a *testimonium paupertatis* as the Romish hierarchy at this crisis. I hardly know any book that has preserved any shadow of reputation but the Abbé Guénée's 'Letters of Certain Jews to Voltaire' ; and from the Protestant Church of that day I do

not know of any reply at all. Christianity, as it then was, could not be defended. It would have been a miracle of the wrong kind had any addition been made to apologetics that would have sheltered the oppressive superstition of the one Church and the meagre rationalism of the other from the blasts of judgment" (p. 163).

At the beginning of the next lecture the author calls attention to the following distinguishing features of German Rationalism: First, "The German movement does not arise out of grievances," and is not a protest against privileged ecclesiastics; secondly, "the controversy was not conducted by men outside the Christian body"; and thirdly, "the results were far more of the nature of compromise." German Rationalism as a movement in the Church, conducted by theologians fully trained and not by amateurs—hence, on the whole, in a more reverent spirit, and with more learning, is compared to the Unitarian controversy of New England and the Broad Churchism of Great Britain. The three types of Rationalism are, first, Popular Rationalism; secondly, Critical Rationalism; and thirdly, Ethical Rationalism. We have not space to follow this discussion, or, indeed, to do more in connection with this lecture than call attention to a most important statement. Speaking of the distinction between a Revelation and the record of it, made in the Wolfenbüttel fragments—a distinction of which Coleridge afterward made so much, a distinction for which Dr. Bruce pleads so earnestly in his recent book on the "Chief End of a Revelation," a distinction confessedly of great importance as well as of great *obviousness*—Dr. Cairns says, that while no doubt we may lay stress on the difference between the substance of Christianity and its Biblical records in arguing for the general truth of Christianity against unbelievers, yet "the question of inspiration is not thereby reduced to unimportance; and we ought, I think, in the widest view of the facts, to go beyond Lessing and Coleridge in contending for the full inspiration of the Scripture record" (p. 209); that is to say, Dr. Cairns recognizes the very important distinction between the apologetic and the dogmatic attitude in the discussion of this question.

The tendencies of unbelief in the present age, as contrasted with those of the eighteenth century, constitute the author's theme in his closing lecture. These tendencies are said to be, first, a more radical anti-supernaturalism; and secondly, a more earnest effort to account for Christianity as a phenomenon, on natural principles. "This is the religious programme of the nineteenth century as contrasted with the eighteenth"; and "in this labor of unbelief the life of Christ is the central field."

The author then deals with the views of Strauss, Rénan, and Mill respecting the supernatural, and closes with some reflections which we quote, for the sake of the last, which we deem of vast importance, and one that should be laid to heart: 1. The changeful and fluctuating character of doubt and denial in regard to Christianity; 2. That Christianity has advanced in spite of all adverse argument; 3. *That Christianity is not promoted by changing either its type of doctrine or its style of evidence*—a sentiment that we take the liberty of writing in italics for the sake of emphasizing our appreciation of it.

FRANCIS L. PATTON.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF GEORGE LAWSON, D.D., Selkirk, Professor of Theology to Associate Synod: With Glimpses of Scottish Character from 1720 to 1820. By the Rev. JOHN MACFARLANE, LL.D., Clapham, London. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers.

In the early days of rationalism in the Church of Scotland, four faithful ministers, in defending orthodoxy and the constitutional right of the congregations to elect their pastors, came under censure of the General Assembly, and were deposed from their pastoral charges. Three years later—in 1736—they formed a separate Presbytery, which they called Associate, more commonly known as Seceder. Many of the orthodox ministers and people, joined them. They soon became a numerous body, a strong defence of the national Confession through those long dreary years

when the national Church was unreliable to the cause, if not untrue. It was necessary that the seceders should have a theological seminary of their own. In selecting their early professors they were signally fortunate. James Fisher, John Brown, and George Lawson as theologians, were leaders whom it was honorable to follow, and who might have conferred honor upon any ecclesiastical connection in Christendom.

George Lawson was one of the best balanced men of genius on the records of literature. That he was a man of genius as well as of piety and learning, is put beyond question by the work which he did, the nature of the influence he wielded, and the character he bore. In his work as a teacher, notwithstanding his vast learning, his train of thought was native and original, glowing with that human inspiration which burns instruction into the being of other men. Those who studied under him, not only received theological knowledge and training, they also contracted from him a holy zeal in their work; his subdued simplicity of manner presented little for superficial imitation, but they partook of his moral life, of his devotion to truth, his harmonious sobriety and warmth of thinking, and wheresoever they went carried with them an elevating impression of his character. We read of these effects in Scotland, we have met with them among the mountains of Pennsylvania. They are beyond the capacity of mere learning to produce. Anecdotes are told of him implying eccentricity, but all else known about him bears the mark, not of eccentricity, but of large, sound learning and well-balanced thought far-reaching and healthily practical.

With a memory of extraordinary comprehension and tenacity, and untiring application, Dr. Lawson, in his long life, secured attainments of an extent impossible to ordinary men. With his pastorate in Selkirk—from 1771—his professorship ran parallel from 1787 until his death in 1821. During all that time the course of his duties “nor made a pause nor left a void,” and brought him into close relations with all the ministers of his ecclesiastical connection, as well as with other men of eminence beyond those bounds. Sketches, generally brief, of many historical persons thus connected with him, as friends or pupils, give additional interest to the story of his life, which, told as Dr. Macfarlane tells it, is a broad beam of light thrown upon seventy years of the Associate Church.

To rescue such an example from perishing was a service to the interests of instruction, for which the public owes to the memory of Dr. Macfarlane a debt of gratitude. A little later the attempt would have been too late. The book, now published in this country, appeared in England nearly twenty years ago, but even that was forty years after the death of Dr. Lawson, when those who knew him well were greatly diminished in number. Dr. Macfarlane interposed at a juncture beyond which his work might have been impossible. He has executed it in a bright, attractive style, presenting the learned professor and devoted minister of the Gospel in his proper surroundings of romantic scenery and of educated society, Christian and literary. Entertaining to any class of thoughtful readers, it is a book which cannot fail to be profitable to theological students and young ministers of the Gospel.

JAMES C. MOFFAT.

III.—SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

THE THEISTIC ARGUMENT AS AFFECTED BY RECENT THEORIES. By J. LEWIS DIMAN, D.D. Lowell Institute Lectures. pp. viii. 392. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1881.

History was Professor Diman's special department, but Philosophy was his first love; and while the present volume is, perhaps, not the best monument of the lament-

ed author's erudition and ability that we might have had, it is a proof that he had not lost his interest in his earlier studies, and we are glad to welcome it as a fresh contribution to the literature of the theistic controversy. The lectures are remarkably free from technical phraseology, and possess the decided merit of presenting the current phases of theistic discussion in language easily intelligible to the un-metaphysical reader. This constitutes their chief excellence. As noticed in the preface, Professor Diman availed himself in the preparation of his lectures of the writings of Paul Janet and Professor Flint; and there are still a few passages that have escaped the eye of Professor Fisher, which, in a subsequent edition of the work, should be noted as evidently indicative of the author's indebtedness to these writers.

Apart from the excellent style in which it is written, the book is to be commended for the cautious and judicial temper that pervades it. The author does not try to prove more than he is able to prove, and he refuses to allow the theistic debate to turn upon the question of *immanence* or *transcendence*. He regards the universe as a phenomenon to be explained, and his book is an attempt to show that the most rational, indeed the only rational, explanation is given in the conception of an infinite and personal God, possessing intelligence, will, and moral attributes. In the prosecution of his argument, Professor Diman follows substantially the old method of the cosmological, teleological, and ontological proofs, which, however much it may be modified, must continue to be in the main the rubric of theistic discussion. Following Professor Flint, he considers the ontological argument last; and following Janet, but here differing from Flint, he distinguishes between the argument based on "order" and that based on "design." Of the ætiological argument, strictly so called, we do not see that he has made a great deal, though he is unable to agree with Professor Knight in the proposal to "dismiss the doctrine of a first cause from the science of Natural Theology." He calls attention to the disposition in scientific discussions to admit the existence of a permanent something behind phenomena, which he considers as a concession in favor of a first cause. This, however, does not take us far; and we do not see how much can be made out of the ætiological argument until cause is taken entirely out of the category of physical antecedence and its true type is understood to be volition. As Mansel says in his "Prolegomena Logica": "My first and only presentation of power or causality is thus to be found in my consciousness of *myself as willing*." The argument based on the order of the world follows next in the discussion, and teleology occupies the space given to the fifth, sixth, and seventh lectures. This part of the discussion is well managed, though we do not agree with the author in the statement that the design-argument is not a case of analogical reasoning; nor can we say that the discussion is unaffected by the "various conflicting theories restricting the nature and the origin of mind." This might be the case if what follows in the next sentence were true: "These have no direct bearing on the existence and operation of mind as a fact of human consciousness." Lord Brougham said very truly: "The belief that mind exists is essential to the whole argument by which we infer that Deity exists." But the denial of the existence of mind is not only the logical consequence, but the avowed result of the materialistic theories as to its genesis; and of course, if the realization of purpose in our own case is mechanically explained, we have no basis for reasoning that the realization of purpose in the world must be explained by the hypothesis of a Divine intelligence. It is quite proper to show, of course, as far as we can, that the theistic position is not affected by scientific hypotheses; but those who hold antagonistic theories of the universe must join issue somewhere, and we believe that the doctrine of mind, and whatever is essential to the doctrine, is a point of fundamental importance in the theistic conception of the universe.

Mr. Jackson says that Natural Theology includes "two separate sets of premises drawn from different sources. One of these factors rests upon our human

knowledge of the natural world we live in ; the other requires a deeper kind of knowledge, and one far less cultivated upon inductive principles—the knowledge, that is to say, of our nature—our essential humanity and selfness ” (“ Philosophy of Natural Theology,” p. 81). Corresponding to these two sets of premises are the two sets of objections, which are of special interest just now. In the first place it is alleged that the doctrine of evolution in general, and that of natural selection in particular, have given the death-blow to teleology, by showing that what have been regarded as proofs of intentionality, are the necessary results of an indefinite set of physical antecedents. The theist has two courses open to him—he may deny the truth of evolution and natural selection, or, without admitting their truth, may show that, even if they were true, they would not affect the teleological argument. The latter is the common method of apologists just now ; and Diman, following Flint, Janet, and others, shows that, admitting all that is claimed as to the method of the genesis of the phenomenal world, this does not answer the question, Whence the order and adaptation in Nature ? Articulate the phenomenon universe as we may, the question still emerges, Has all this come to pass by accident, or is it the product of intelligence ? But, on the other hand, it may be admitted, as by most philosophical minds it is admitted, that order and finality are everywhere apparent. Then the question is, whether this is not a mere subjective necessity of our thinking, having no objective reality ; whether this finality is not immanent in Nature, having no cause external to Nature ; and whether this immanent intelligence is not unconscious, following the analogy of instinct rather than of human consciousness. These are the most important questions in the theistic controversy of this age ; and we know of no book accessible to the general reader, covering the whole theistic discussion, which deals with them as lucidly as the one under consideration. Janet deals with these questions more fully, however, and it should be said that Professor Diman is largely indebted to him.

After dealing with the teleological, the author discusses the moral argument, and in subsequent lectures treats of “ History and a Moral Purpose,” “ Personality and the Infinite,” “ The Alternative Theories,” and “ The Inferences from Theism.”

FRANCIS L. PATTON.

FAITH, DOUBT, AND EVIDENCE : God's Vouchers for His Written Word. With Critical Illustrations from the Autobiography of Dr. Franklin. By G. B. CHEEVER, D.D. New York : A. D. F. Randolph & Co.

It may well be doubted whether Dr. Cheever could write an uninteresting book if he tried. Such is the vigor of his thought, the intensity of his convictions, and the earnestness of his soul that he pours forth a flood of argument, illustration, and appeal that by its vehemence carries the reader away even against his will. Especially is this felt by devout persons who are in sympathy with the author's main purpose. All such will, we think, find their faith quickened and enlarged by the perusal of these glowing chapters.

Yet while agreeing with Dr. Cheever's main point, we can hardly assent to some of the positions taken on the way to it. For instance, in the preface he says, in explanation of the title of his book, “ Hope implies doubt.” This is surely not a self-evident proposition, but rather the contrary. The old writers used to say, “ Doubt was a bad weed, but it grew upon good ground,” meaning that careless persons did not feel enough interest in the subject even to have question about their eternal welfare. Still the weed itself is bad, and a scriptural hope rather excludes than implies doubt. Again, when Dr. Cheever's proposes to determine disputed questions as to the text of Scripture by what he calls the internal evidence, *i. e.*, the common conscience of Christendom (p. 134), we demur. Biblical criticism deals with questions of fact, and can settle them in no other way than by the established rules of evidence. In a rare case where the proofs are equally balanced the anal-

ogy of faith may come in as decisive, but certainly not elsewhere. Otherwise, criticism ceases to be a science, and subjective experience takes the place of sober demonstration.

In the first part of the volume the author makes good use of the fact now well known that the original manuscript of Dr. Franklin's autobiography was lost sight of for many years, while an alleged copy, revised and greatly altered by his grandson, had been published and received everywhere as the genuine work. He uses this to exemplify the possibility of mistake in criticisms of the text founded on the comparison of manuscripts. Still this is a possibility which no reputable critic denies or doubts. But no one can argue from the unknown or the simply possible. In judging of the genuineness of a disputed passage one must decide upon the testimony that is accessible. If the authorities preponderate against the passage, and no plausible reason can be suggested why the words if ever in the text should have been omitted, but on the contrary, much for their insertion if originally omitted, then fidelity to truth requires us to decide against them at whatever sacrifice of feeling.

TALBOT W. CHAMBERS.

THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION OF FAITH. With Introduction and Notes, by the Rev. JOHN MACPHERSON, M.A., Findhorn. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, 1881. A special edition imported for use in this country, price 80 cts., by Scribner & Welford, New York City.

This admirable book is one of a series of treatises entitled "Handbooks for Bible Classes," prepared by different authors, and the entire series edited by Rev. Marcus Dods, D.D., of Glasgow, and the Rev. Alexander Whyte, D.D., of Edinburgh. These cover, as far as already published, commentaries on several of the most important books of Scripture, and treatises on such capital topics as the "Life of Christ," "The Sacraments," "The Reformation," "The Doctrines of Grace," "Church and State," "Christian Ethics," etc., etc.

It is obviously impossible to exaggerate the importance of such a series, and if, as a body, these topics are treated with the learning, ability, and fidelity to truth which distinguishes the "Notes to the Confession of Faith," we ought to secure their republication and general circulation in America.

As already said, the "Notes," or rather the introduction to, and exposition of, the Confession of Faith, is learned, able, judicious, and doctrinally sound. The recently recovered historical information as to the members, and as to the discussions, of the Westminster Assembly, is freely used by Mr. Macpherson in interpreting the sense of the Confession, and its relation to the various schools of Reformed Theology. The author takes, in the main, the true ground as to the moderation and breadth of the statements of our Confession upon points in controversy among Calvinists, and high ground as to the truth and permanent significance of the essential principles of the Calvinistic system, and the moral obligation resting upon every subscriber to the Confession, to maintain those principles inviolate. The five knotty points of Calvinism "may not be stated now in exactly the same phraseology, but the points themselves remain as theological attainments, constituting the very essence of the Calvinistic creed. All true Calvinists cling to those characteristic expressions of doctrine, as tenaciously as their precursors did in the Synod of Dort, and in the Westminster Assembly. He who renounces the doctrinal positions underlying those so-called knotty points, does not thereby pass from high to moderate Calvinism, but actually passes over to the ranks of the anti-Calvinists, and abandons the standpoint of the Reformed Confessions."

There are two positions taken in the exposition to which we would take exception. In the first place, the author (p. 21) identifies "Calvinism" pure and simple with the special form that doctrine takes in the writings of Calvin himself, and distinguishes this from the non-essential variations which characterized as specific dif-

ferences the various schools of his disciples. We believe this to be entirely a mistake. Calvinism is just a general term to express a system of Christian doctrine, including in the genus all the specific variations. This system existed from the times of Paul and Augustine, and it includes many varieties. It has a history, and hence the term has a sense fixed by that history. In that sense its standard is the consensus of the Confessions of the Reformed Churches, and of the great classical Reformed theologians. In this *consensus* we have the generic essence of the system, while in the variations of the Confessions, and writers, we have the specific differences.

In the second place, the author maintains that the Westminster Confession of Faith was alone designed to be the public doctrinal standard of the subscribing Churches, while the Catechisms, prepared by the same committee, and issued by the authority of the same Assembly, were designed simply to be used for the purpose of conveying catechetical instruction. Hence that the Catechisms, as affirmed by an act of the Free Church Assembly in 1851, have no confessional authority; and that in consequence of this difference of design, the Westminster Assembly, in drawing up the Confession of Faith, confined itself to general statements of the essential principles of the Calvinistic system, while the same Assembly, a year afterward, introduced more precise statements, on points upon which Calvinists differ into the Longer and subsequently into the Shorter Catechism. And that while these peculiarities of the Catechisms express the personal opinions of their authors, they were not intended either directly to bind the churches, or to explain the meaning of the Confession.

It seems to us, on the other hand, that an authoritative formula for catechising the children of the Church cannot be supposed to contain elements of doctrine which the Church as such does not profess to believe, or to go further into details of doctrinal definition than the formula intended as the standard of ministerial communion. What we are authoritatively instructed to teach the children, we are *ipso facto* instructed to believe and profess. Besides the fact that the Catechisms were prepared by the same men, and issued by the deliberate vote of the same Assembly, after a lapse of months of further study and discussion, necessarily cause them to be the most authoritative possible exposition of the sense the corresponding definitions of the Confession were intended to bear.

And whatever may be the state of ecclesiastical law in the several Presbyterian Churches of Scotland on this head, the Catechisms, as well as and as much as the Confession of the Westminster Assembly, are the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Churches of America.

The Adopting Act of 1729 declares that the "Confession and Longer and Shorter Catechisms of the Assembly of divines at Westminster" were "adopted as the Confession of our faith." This Adopting Act was referred to and accepted as the common historical basis of both Branches by the terms of Reunion, adopted 1869.

The printing and binding of this little book is perfect; and ought to direct the taste and excite the emulation of some of our American publishers.

A. A. HODGE.

MESSIAH THE PRINCE; OR, THE MEDIATORIAL DOMINION OF JESUS CHRIST. By WILLIAM SYMINGTON, D.D., late Professor of Theology in the Reformed Presbyterian Church. With a Memoir of the Author by his Sons. London: T. Nelson & Sons, Paternoster Row; Edinburgh; and New York. 1881.

Dr. Symington is best known in America by his admirable work on the "Atonement and Intercession of Jesus Christ," which for many years was a text-book in our theological seminaries, and still retains its place as a classic in our Presbyterian theological literature. It is also remembered as the first volume republished at the suggestion of Dr. Archibald Alexander, by those eminent dispensers of religious truth in its purest and sweetest forms, Robert Carter & Brothers, of New York City.

The work here republished was issued by its author in the latter part of 1838, four years after the treatise on the Atonement. Although less famous, this work on the "Mediatorial Dominion of Jesus Christ" is more original, and is better adapted to meet a practical want in the relations of the Church to the world in the present generation, especially in America. The author founds his argument upon the Word of God, the Christian consciousness, and the experience of the Church. He conducts it with a logic perfectly unanswerable, and expounds it in a lucid and simple style; and he includes in his discussion the entire field of his subject in all of its essential relations—as the Qualifications of Christ for His Mediatorial Dominion: its nature, spirituality, necessity, and universality, and His divine appointment thereto; His mediatorial dominion over the Church and over the nations, and its perpetuity. No subject is of more vital, practical importance, and none is more neglected among us, than the relation which the Lord Jesus, and the revelation of His will recorded in the Christian Scriptures, sustains to human governments, civil and social laws and their administration, and above all to the great department of national education. We heartily commend this work of Dr. Symington to all who desire light upon this subject.

Although he occupied so eminent a position in the entire Presbyterian world during the middle third of this century, yet twenty years have elapsed since his death before even this slender memoir of his life has been brought to completion by his surviving son. It is, as it professes to be, only a meagre sketch, yet it reveals the true greatness of its subject. As preacher and theologian, he was not only the first man in his denomination (the old Covenanter or Reformed Presbyterian body), but one of the first in Scotland. The first twenty years of his ministry were passed in the small town of Stranraer, in Wigtonshire. Here his ministry attracted the attention of all classes, and all varieties of Churchmen and Dissenters. His influence extended throughout the south-west of Scotland, so that a competent judge testifies, "that in short what in these days Dr. Chalmers was to Glasgow, and Dr. Andrew Thompson to the west end of Edinburgh, that in many respects was William Symington in Wigtonshire and Galloway." In 1839 he was transferred to the pastorate of Great Hamilton Street Chapel, Glasgow, which he held with increasing fame and usefulness until his death, January, 1862. He was appointed to the chair of Theology on the death of his brother, Dr. Andrew Symington, in 1854, and was reinforced by his son-in-law, Rev. Wm. H. Goold, D.D., as a colleague, who, upon the union of the Free and Reformed Presbyterian Churches in 1876 and '7, was the first Moderator of the united body.

A. A. HODGE.

IV.—PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

DIE KATECHETIK FÜR SCHULE UND KIRCHE. Neubearbeitet von L. KRAUSZOLD. Erlangen: 1880. B. Westermann & Co., New York.

This work was first published in 1843, and received at the time high praise from the theological Reviews for its careful and able treatment of the subject. After more than a third of a century, it is now republished, a good deal enlarged and improved. Dr. Krauszold is a veteran in the pastorate, and is entitled by his long and varied experience, as well as by his learning and admirable spirit, to speak with authority on the important questions belonging to the sphere of catechetics. Some of these questions are full of difficulty, especially in our own day, and require great judgment, candor, and practical wisdom in order to answer them aright. They are, indeed, the fundamental questions of Christian nurture. Dr. K. discusses them in a clear and thorough manner, and although he does it, of course, largely from the German point of view, yet many, if not most of his conclusions are full of value for us and in substantial harmony with the old doctrine and practice of the Presbyterian Church.

We wish his book might be translated, or its main points at least reproduced in our own tongue; for it could not fail to be very helpful to the study among us of a branch of Practical Theology which has been and still is sadly neglected. All the vital principles of catechetics are contained in our standards, and belong to the history of our family life and religious training; but they need to be carefully restated, expounded, and urged home upon the mind and heart of our people. We consider revival of catechetical instruction, in forms best adapted to our own age, one of the most pressing wants of the Presbyterian Church.

G. L. PRENTISS.

DR. RICHARD ROTHE'S *GESCHICHTE DER PREDIGT*. Von den Anfaengen bis auf Schleiermacher, herausgegeben von August Truempelmann. Bremen: Verlag von M. Heinsius. 1881. B. Westermann & Co., New York.

That this book should be published at all, now fourteen years after Rothe's death, is no ordinary tribute of respect to its distinguished author.

At the age of twenty-five, by appointment of the Prussian Court, Rothe became preacher of the Protestant congregation in Rome. In this service he was the successor of Schmieder, the predecessor of Tholuck, and the intimate associate of Bunsen. After laboring here from 1824 to 1828, he became professor at Wittenberg. It was a part of his duty, in this chair, to lecture on selected instances of ancient and modern eloquence, with especial reference to the demands of the pulpit. Out of this, apparently, grew his course on the "History of Preaching." He had already elaborated it as early as the summer of 1835. The body of it is therefore the production of his younger years. He revised it, however, more than once as he grew older and riper. A special revision seems to have been made in 1850, when he delivered the course on the History of Preaching publicly in Bonn. It was again subjected to a systematic revision in 1864. But it does not appear that Rothe ever designed it for publication. If he had such a design, his death, in 1867, prevented its being carried out.

Not counting the revised edition of his great work on "Theological Ethics," the last three volumes of which were published posthumously, the "History of Preaching" is the fourth important work of Rothe's which has appeared since his death. His university lectures on "Dogmatics" were edited by Schenkel, in two parts, in 1870; a volume of essays, entitled "Stille Stunden," came out in 1872; and his lectures on "Church History," edited by Weingarten, in 1875. To these, and to the important works published in his lifetime, the present work is now added.

This work devotes about twenty-three pages to the period before Constantine, about one hundred and fifty-eight to that from Constantine to Charles the Great, about one hundred and eighty-three to the period from Charles to the Reformation, and about one hundred and eighteen to that following the Reformation. In each period it aims to be, not merely a history of preaching, but a history of preaching and preachers. It discusses the position of preaching in the Church, its relation to other parts of worship and other forms of Church activity, its especial characteristics and aims, for each successive period; and it gives, with considerable detail, an account of the preachers of each period; analyzing the peculiarities of a few, and to a limited extent giving specimens of their productions, and adding to this lists of the names of others. It aims to do this for all the leading Christian countries, and for all the branches of the Church. This work of Rothe is supplemented by the notes of the editor, and by about thirty-two pages of preface, index, and appendix, the appendix being a discussion of the position of Hippolytus in a history of preaching.

These facts in regard to the external history and mechanical structure of the book largely account for the character of its contents. Estimated according to its own claims, it is an exceedingly valuable contribution to sacred literature. It is not extended enough for an encyclopedia, nor discriminating enough for a manual.

Could the author have edited his own work, he would doubtless have greatly increased its value. The editor might have done the same, if he had possessed the liberty which the author would have exercised, for making corrections and additions. It would be easy to criticise the judgment which, in giving an account of British preachers, devotes nearly three pages to Joseph Fawcett, and but six letters to Jeremy Taylor; which makes "Lorentz Sterne" a representative preacher, and does not even mention John Knox, John Bunyan, or Richard Baxter. One might multiply particulars of this sort, but in the circumstances it would hardly be fair. In spite of such imperfections, we have reason to be glad that the book has been published. Rothe is always suggestive, even when one does not agree with him. For one whose purpose is to run over in a hasty, but somewhat detailed review, the whole subject of Christian preaching and preachers, perhaps no better book has been published. And it is by no means without its uses to other classes of students.

The point of view from which Rothe looks at preaching is largely that formed during his own pastoral experience in Rome. He wrote from Rome, as early as 1827, concerning his "inward repugnance against all attempts at immediate edification, against all fine talking about feelings, especially if they should be premeditated or preconceived, against all spreading out into words of things which in their nature are only 'spirit and truth.'" He affirmed a growing conviction that true edification is only "through the truth and upon its foundation, never upon the ground of a momentary excitement or subjective feeling." Dr. Samuel Osgood, in the thirty-first volume of the "Bibliotheca Sacra," thus epitomizes this characteristic, which seems equally to belong to Rothe as preacher in Rome and as lecturer on the History of Christian Preaching:

"He has striven under this conviction to be content with setting forth the simple truth in his preaching, without any of the heats, not merely of eloquence, but of what is much more difficult to avoid, of feeling. The great essential with the preacher is real knowledge, both by experience and thought. It is useless, according to him, to look for the rich, ripe fruit except from the living tree. The way of actual regeneration to the life from God and in God is so gradual, so hidden and inward among the ways of this outward life, that we can show it to others only by strict quiet, humility, prudence, gentleness, and patience, and it is hurt by nothing more than by the rash haste which leaves out of sight the deliberate method of God in all His ways in nature and history."

WILLIS J. BEECHER.

1. HOMILETISCHE LEKTIONEN. VON HEINRICH BECK, Pfarrer. Erste Hälfte, Erlangen: A. Deichert. New York: B. Westermann & Co.
2. DAS GEBET DES HERRN AUS DER ZEIT UND FÜR DIE ZEIT. VON G. HÄFFNER. *Ibid.*
3. DIE KIRCHE IM GLAUBEN DES EVANGELISCHEN CHRISTEN. VON K. HACKEN-SCHMIDT. *Ibid.*
4. DAS EVANGELISCHE PFARRHAUSE IN SEINER SOZIALEN BEDEUTUNG. VON W. WIENER. Gotha: F. A. Perthes.

The first of these volumes is part of a series of selections from the standard writers of the Lutheran Church from Luther to Riegel, intended to serve the use of those churches which, in addition to the regular preaching of the Word, have subsidiary exercises in which approved printed matter is read before the congregation. The selections are of suitable length, are arranged according to the ecclesiastical year, and are fair specimens of the homiletical wealth of the Lutheran Church. In one of the extracts from Luther we find a passage as weighty and seasonable now as when first uttered by the great Reformer. At the close of an enforcement of parental duty, he says: "If, my dear Christian friend, you have a boy clever at learning, you are not free to bring him up as you please, but you owe it to God to train your child for His service. God has need of pastors, preachers, school teachers. Now if you can give Him one of these, and yet refuse to do it, you are not robbing a poor man of his coat, but you are, so far as in you lies, keeping many souls out of heaven and sending them to hell. For you take away the man who is fitted to deliver such souls. On the other hand, do you educate a son for a *seelsorger*?

You do not clothe the poor, or found a school or a church, but you do a far greater good; you furnish a minister who can help many thousand souls to heaven. Even in a worldly sense you serve king and country better in this way than by building castles or cities, or gathering all the treasures of the world; for what avail these, if there be no learned and wise and pious men?"

The second work on the list is a practical treatise on the Lord's Prayer. The author touches critical questions lightly, but shows that he is acquainted with the results of scholarship both ancient and modern, thus contrasting favorably with the so-called practical writers among us who forget to lay the foundation of their work in a thorough study of the original text. Pastor Haffner expounds the *Vater-Unser* "from the time," *i. e.*, the circumstances in which it was uttered, and applies it "to the time"—to our own day. He insists, properly as we think, that the invocation does not address God as the Father of the human race, but as the Father of His covenant people. And so he proceeds with a thoughtful, fresh, and vigorous presentation of the truths suggested in this incomparable model of devotion, occasionally administering a sharp thrust at the superstitions sometimes bound up with it even in Protestant communions. He accepts Luther's view of the fourth petition as for *daily* bread, and he gives up the genuineness of the Doxology, while acquiescing in the opinion of Harms that "such a conclusion lies properly in the praying heart," and will never be surrendered by the people.

The third brochure consists of two addresses on the conflict between Pietism and Confessionalism, one of which is intended to show what the Church is not, and the other what it is. The Church is not a storehouse of grace, nor a source of doctrine, nor the earthly kingdom of God controlling individuals and the State. On the contrary, it is a fellowship of faith as opposed to a false liberalism, a fellowship of confession as opposed to a false Unionism, and a fellowship of Christian activity as opposed to a disorganizing Separatism. These points are urged with energy and good temper, and are calculated to have weight in Germany, where the circumstances are so different from our own.

The same may be said of the last volume before us, which treats of the Evangelical Parsonage in its social relations. The author, himself a Gospel minister, discusses many points treated among us in books on Pastoral Theology, but always in reference to the position and influence of a clergyman in society. Thus he has chapters on the minister's relations to morals, science, art, the school, the State, confessions, parties, social questions, establishments, etc. He shows a wide acquaintance with the past and the present, writes with good sense and fervor, and finally gives good reason for the opinion that the clergy has rather risen than sunk in popular estimation. A short extract will furnish a specimen of the author's tone and method. In reply to the secularists who complain that religion deludes men by offering eternity instead of a supply for present needs, and who therefore cry, First of all give us bread, he quotes the saying, "Man doth not live by bread alone," and then says: "If one wants to get, and keep, and increase his bread, he must be industrious, temperate, and honest; otherwise every new division of property would be vain. But if a man means to practice these virtues, he must have wisdom and patience, must possess an enlightened conscience and keep fast hold of the thought of God's presence and of His judgment. But these things, as well as the successful administration of law and government, presuppose the activity of the minister of religion." These are commonplaces, but unfortunately they need to be often repeated in our day, and here as well as in Europe. TALBOT W. CHAMBERS.

LECTURES ON THE FIRST PRAYER-BOOK OF KING EDWARD VI. By MORGAN DIX, S.T.D., Rector of Trinity Church, New York. New York: E. & J. B. Young & Co. 1881.

We feel like apologizing to the readers of the PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW for devoting even two or three lines of notice to this foolish performance. The ecclesiastical

stripe of the writer as well as his literary quality may be judged by the fact, that he speaks of "individuals or parties still enamored of the notions and worshipping the names of Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, and others of that ilk"; and systematically reviles Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, Tyndal, and all the great founders of his Church.

It is impossible to work up any higher sentiment than one of contempt for the ignorance and presumption displayed in this book. The Rev. Morgan Dix is a Protestant Episcopal "priest"—so he rejoices to be called—of Trinity church, New York. If the game were worth the candle, I would transmute him into the Rev. Magor Missabib; and make him an astonishment to himself, and to all them that are round about him—"of *that ilk*." But we waive the discussions. If we are to review the English Reformation, we want a worthier text than these lectures furnish.

SAMUEL M. HOPKINS.

THROUGH THE PRISON TO THE THRONE: Illustrations of Life from the Biography of Joseph. By the Rev. JOSEPH S. VAN DYKE. New York: I. K. Funk & Co.

This little book is one of rare excellence in many respects. Written like Hunter's "Sacred Biography," and modestly confessing its indebtedness in the preface, it has original merits more than Hunter, making it a repository of instruction exceptionally solid and profitable. Proverbial wisdom has emptied her treasures into the racy framework of this one scriptural story. Indeed, the amount of pithy and pertinent aphorism is wonderful in motto and moral; freighting the recital to excess, and perhaps abating the movement of narrative with incisive abstractions, which are woven in, at every turn, with surprising ingenuity.

It is a book to be studied. Extensive learning is found on its pages. Egyptology, condensed with admirable skill, from the volumes of Bunsen, Sharp, Wilkinson, and Lepsius, is given instructively to any reader whether educated or not.

Although it may be said the style is rather elaborate, the reader is not wearied, the words are not prosy, the profit of rich thought attracts our interest on every page; and the well-pointed application of its lessons by an acute and erudite observer, to advanced thinking and progressive usages, cannot fail to bring "Moses and the Prophets" into fresh admiration, as the shadow of their inspiration is to be seen over all the heat and haste of modern life.

This book is the production of one who is called a country pastor; another illustration of the fact, that country pastors are the bone and sinew of the Presbyterian Church. They ought to write more. The retreat of quite life and patient study would hardly suffer the press to be stuffed with tissue paper. A. T. MCGILL.

DIVINE GUIDANCE. Memorial of Allen W. Dodge. By GAIL HAMILTON. 12mo, pp. 328. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1881.

That this memoir should be written was not a matter of special public concern. Cultivated, manly, estimable, locally honored as its subject was, this memorial was demanded, not so much by any widespread desire or need, as by Miss Dodge's state of mind in regard to her "friend,"—a kinsman, we presume. A brief period of four years within his life is very much a mystery, and wholly unsatisfactory to her. The transcript of his journal for that period occupies more than a third of her volume. The experiences of that time are an offence to her, in respect to which she has quite an outspoken quarrel with the Lord of providence and grace, as well as with orthodoxy. It need hardly be said that she is not a woman of an eminently teachable or reverent mind, and for the present is likely, above many others, to find things in the ways of God which she cannot understand. The "divine guidance" to which the title points, so far as it is clear and satisfactory, does not lead into, but out of, the "miserable, wasteful, irrational, anxious, self-inspecting fanaticism" of the years in question, three of which were spent in the Seminary at Andover, in preparation for

a ministry upon which he never entered. He had, under the pressure of an overwhelming bereavement, which came upon him as he was entering upon a brilliant career in law and letters in New York, been strangely penetrated by orthodoxy (p. 115), and was for a time completely overmastered by it. Except that his mother was mournfully, devoutly orthodox, his antecedents and environment had been Unitarian. This new type of his religious experience is Presbyterianism to the discriminating authoress (p. 301), although the Journal shows that it was aversion to the "sectarian, high Presbyterian" character which he thought he discovered in a reconnaissance at Princeton (p. 201), that sent him to Andover, where he lived his unnatural, unintelligible life. He feasted on Henry, Wilberforce, Payson, James, Doddridge, Abbott, Brainerd, Taylor, and Baxter, "books which can hardly be administered too homœopathically." He admired the missionary consecration of George Champion, who in her view by staying at home "would have had ten thousand dollars besides to devote to his Master's service, and would have comforted the heart of his poor old grandfather, who was nearer to him, and more sacredly his charge and duty, than every beastly Zulu of them all" (p. 253).

Of course the well-known "smartness" of Gail Hamilton appears wherever her hand touches the material offered her, with flippancy as little surprising, and wondering ignorance in regard to many of the ways of the Spirit. We do not say that nothing strained or abnormal mingled with the legitimate experiences of those years.

Mr. Dodge's life was useful and honored in Eastern Massachusetts, where he lived as a cultured farmer and gentleman, and acted the part of a true Christian citizen in neighborhood, town, and State for the forty years that followed his turning away from the threshold of the ministry. He would have adorned much more conspicuous positions.

CHARLES A. AIKEN.

CONSECRATED WOMEN. By CLAUDIA. "The king's daughter is all glorious within: her clothing is of wrought gold."—Psalm xlv. 13. Pp. 344, 12mo. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1880.

The author of this compilation has kept herself in retirement, giving us no clue to her personality. She is evidently herself one of our Lord's "consecrated women," animated with a burning desire to advance the cause of Christ in the world, and to develop an elevated and consecrated type of womanhood. The inscription shows both her purpose and her inspiration. It is a beautiful testimony to Christian motherhood. "To the memory of my MOTHER, whose holy living diffused brightness and fragrance along the cloudy and dusty paths of daily life, to the praise of the Saviour, who had redeemed her and who enabled her from childhood down to advanced age to be a witness for Him."

She aims to reproduce, in the goodly company of godly women to be found in the church, such noble specimens of the true woman as was her own exemplary and revered mother. She deals especially "with the tender relationships of sister and mother," with particular reference to that saying of our Lord: "Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother and sister and mother."

To this end, with genuine tact and discrimination, she has culled from the great storehouse of noble deeds done for the Master's sake by consecrated and cultured women, both married and single, stories of the life-work of seventeen sisters, wives, and mothers, who, scorning a career of fashionable gayety, of frivolous pleasure, and of busy idleness, have first given themselves to the Lord who bought them with His own blood, and then devoted themselves to the work of doing good; seeking the lost, rescuing the fallen, teaching the ignorant, feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, leading the lame, comforting the sorrowing, smoothing the pillow of the invalid, and befriending the homeless; ever ready to speak a pleasant word, to instill a useful lesson, and to sow the seed of divine grace in hearts mellowed by adversity.

Such lives are worth living for. A consecrated woman—humble and gentle, self-sacrificing, dead to the world and alive to God—whatever may be her sphere of life, is a divine benediction. "She openeth her mouth with wisdom, and on her tongue is the law of kindness." "Her price is far above rubies."

The most of those, of whose lives brief sketches are given in this volume, are quite unknown to fame. The very names of some of them are new to our English-speaking people. They are selected, not so much for their singularity, as if they stood alone among their sex in the beauty and nobility of their lives, as for their typical characters. Each serves as a specimen of what a whole class of Christian female-workers have done and are now doing, and, more than all, of what may be done, almost always and everywhere, by "consecrated women."

Thus, Catharine of Siena is noted as "praying and watching," Margaret Wilson as "thoroughly furnished unto all good works," Christine Alsop as "a succorer of many," Fidelia Fiske as "watching for souls," and Adelaide L. Newton as "holy in all manner of conversation." The compiler very truly and forcibly says: "To whatever of holy living these women attained, other Christian women may also attain; for the divine words cover the deepest as well as the simplest need: 'My grace is sufficient for thee,' and 'My strength is made perfect in weakness.'"

E. F. HATFIELD.

V.—GENERAL LITERATURE.

THE HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF EUROPE. By EDWARD A. FREEMAN, D.C.L., LL.D., Honorary Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. In 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green & Co.; New York: Scribner & Welford. 1881.

A historical geography of Europe, written by a historian of Mr. Freeman's ability and fame, at once raises the expectation of a standard work which every student of history must add to his reference library. And this expectation is not disappointed. The author informs us that the work was begun several years ago, but was frequently interrupted. Traces of these interruptions are found in occasional repetitions, inconsistencies, and differences of methods; but, taken as a whole, it is the best book in that line. The first and larger volume of 603 pages contains the text, the second volume 65 maps, which are an indispensable companion to the text.

Geography and history are connected as the earth and its inhabitants. The peculiarities of the soil, climate, and scenery enter largely into the character of a nation and aid in determining its work and place in history. This is true also of churches. The Greek Church may be called the church of the East, the Roman Church the church of the South, the Protestant Church the church of the North and of the West. But the geographical boundaries of countries and nations change from time to time. France, Germany, Austria, England, and the United States mean something different in different periods of history, and it is all-important in the study of history to have in the mind's eye the map of the particular period. Historical geography differs from physical geography, as it represents geography in motion and change. Its attention is constantly divided between the land and the people and the effects of events upon the geographical boundaries.

Mr. Freeman begins with Greece and the Greek colonies, then passes on to the Roman Empire, from its formation to its dismemberment and final division. Then follow the rise of the Saracens to its largest extent, the new western empire of Germany, the modern European States, France, Austria, Spain, Italy, England, etc., the Slavonic States, the Ottoman Empire, and the Russian Empire. America is properly excluded, but the United States is noticed characteristically among the colonies of England with the following compliment (p. 559): "The United States of America, a vaster England beyond the ocean, an European power on a level with the

greatest European powers, planted beyond the bounds of Europe, form the great work of English and European enterprise in non-European lands."

PHILIP SCHAFF.

HISTORY OF ANCIENT EGYPT. By GEO. RAWLINSON, M.A. In two volumes, 8vo. pp. xx., 554, 567. Longmans, Green & Co., London; Scribner & Welford, N. Y.

The learned editor of the "History of Herodotus" and author of the "Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World," gives the necessary complement to the latter, and the fruit of the preliminary studies in the former, in his recently-published "History of Ancient Egypt." Indeed, this seems to be the chief justification for its publication, for it is a compilation from the chief authorities on the subject of Egyptology rather than a work of original investigation. It is scholarly, comprehensive, painstaking, and, in the main, written with good judgment and wise selection of the materials in accordance with the method of his previous works, yet lacks the freshness, vigor, grasp of the subject, masterly treatment, and real hearty interest in the theme that characterize the work of Dr. Brugsch. Prof. Rawlinson's interest seems to be that of the museum rather than the land, the mummies rather than the people. Accordingly, his treatment of the introductory matter in Vol. I. is superior to his treatment of the History itself in Vol. II. This method, while it has some advantages for purposes of reference to particular topics, yet involves frequent repetition and tires the reader, who would form a much better conception if the whole of the material had been worked into its proper place in the historical development of the Egyptian people.

We regret to find in Vol. I., p. 8, with a just praise of British enterprise in penetrating the interior of Africa, an unjust ignoring of the German explorers, and especially of the American, Stanley, who, in some respects, did more than all others. We cannot but feel that the victorious armies of Tothmes III. and Rameses II., at least, are slandered by the statement that the Egyptians "at no time made good soldiers"—"whenever they encountered an enemy acquainted with the art of war, they suffered defeat" (p. 106). The treatment of Egyptian Literature is meagre and unsatisfactory. Egyptian Religion is considered in a mechanical fashion at some length, yet without a grasp of its distinctive principles and a genetic unfolding of its doctrines and moral conceptions. The most of the space is given to the names and inter-relation of the various deities. The author, indeed, seems chiefly interested in the Agriculture, Architecture, Mimetic Art, and Manners and Customs of the Egyptians all of which are fully and admirably discussed.

In Vol. II. Prof. Rawlinson admits that Egyptian chronologists will always be divided into the advocates of a longer and a shorter chronology (p. 20), and that "there appears to be at present no means of terminating this controversy." The parallel dynasties and the contemporary reign of father and son make the problem exceedingly complicated, yet we cannot but feel that Prof. Rawlinson is no less arbitrary in insisting upon the minimum, and bringing down the commencement of the monarchy to 2700 B.C., than others are in urging the maximum.

Our author leans to the belief that the Hyksos were Hittites (p. 191), against Brugsch, who holds they were Arabs. He also holds that it was Apepi who made Joseph his Prime Minister (p. 203), that Rameses II. was the Pharaoh of the oppression of the Israelites (p. 326), and that the exodus led by Moses was in the reign of Menephthah (p. 334), in these respects agreeing with the great majority of the Egyptologists of the present day.

The theory of Dr. Brugsch that the twenty-second dynasty was Assyrian, supported by a number of striking arguments, if not altogether convincing, is yet, in our judgment, rather summarily disposed of by Prof. Rawlinson, who regards the dynasty as Bubastite (p. 416).

We congratulate Prof. Rawlinson on this completion of his histories of the Orien-

tal nations. Embracing, as they unquestionably do, a vast amount of information that cannot be found anywhere else in so good a form, they will always prove of great service to students and all those who want a general knowledge of these subjects. A valuable feature of the volumes is the great abundance of illustrations that are given.

C. A. BRIGGS.

BOSTON MONDAY LECTURES, 1880-81: *Christ and Modern Thought*, with a Preliminary Lecture on the Methods of meeting Modern Unbelief. By JOSEPH COOK. Boston: Roberts Brothers.

Most of our readers are aware, that in the absence of Mr. Cook from the country, an attempt was made to continue the course of Monday Lectures which he had established and sustained for successive seasons with unflagging interest in Boston, by putting in his place a succession of the most distinguished thinkers and lecturers that could be procured. The course included ten lectures, delivered on successive Mondays by Bishop Clark of Rhode Island, Dr. E. G. Robinson, President of Brown University, Dr. Thomas Guard, ex-President Hopkins, President McCosh, Chancellor Howard Crosby, Dr. George A. Crooks, Rev. Samuel W. Dike, Dr. J. B. Thomas, Dr. John Cotton Smith. These lectures, with an introductory one by Mr. Cook, delivered in London, make up this book. Of course such a series from such sources form a volume of much, though varying, interest and value; some of them are only new and condensed editions of what the respective authors had already given to the public in other forms, and with larger amplification. Development, evolution, and materialism of course figure largely, and meet different treatment from different hands. These are treated on various sides, and with various fulness by Bishop Clark, Dr. McCosh, and Dr. Hopkins in his prelude to his lecture on Conscience, in relation to which he seems aware that the porch is greater than the house, as in our judgment it is certainly more satisfactory. His analysis of "development, growth, upbuilding" is admirable. We cannot say as much for his treatment of conscience, which seems an attempt to put in a clearer light the theory maintained in his volumes on this subject, and to obviate objections to it. The attempt is in our view unsuccessful. He takes ground against "Bishop Butler, Dugald Stewart, and Wayland and writers on morals generally," in their division of the principles of action into "self-love and conscience" (p. 103). He tells us, "conscience never furnishes the primary motives for action," "does not furnish the grounds of choice," but acts in conjunction with one (principle) higher than itself (p. 107). There must always be some perplexity in discussions by or with the author on this subject, until he defines distinctly what he means by "good," and the "highest good," that constitutes the proper end of action. Does he mean anything over and above pleasure? If so, what? Is his system Hedonism, or is it not? And if not, what is it? There is no room here to cite the passages all through this lecture which require a distinct answer to this question, in order to a clear understanding of the author's position.

Dr. John Cotton Smith's lecture on the "theistic basis of evolution" is both a surprise and a gratification: a surprise—in that he espouses the system so unqualifiedly and enthusiastically, and yet that he sees it to be harmonious, not only with theism, but Christianity; of gratification, at such proofs that men who hold philosophic or scientific dogmas, which seem to us logically so antagonistic to Christianity, are not bound to carry them to their logical results. He asks, "is there any gain for theism in the hypothesis of immediate creation in the introduction of life or of man into the system of nature?" (p. 234). Immediate and special creations appear to him much feebler exhibitions of the wisdom and power of God than "the hypothesis of universal evolution." He adopts the usual objections of evolutionists to "an interrupted process of development." He thinks Darwin's "Descent of Man" "a very strong argument for the hypothesis of universal evolution, or at

least for the derivation of man from the animal life by which he was preceded" (p. 303). Also that "a remarkable confirmation of this view is to be found in the discovery by Professor Marsh of the various stages by which the horse as he now exists has been developed from an animal with five toes" (p. 304). The whole culminates in essaying "the reconciliation of Pantheism with the Personality of God" (p. 313). How the universal evolution of all events and grades of being from the pre-existent elements and forces put *ab initio* in nature, without special divine interposition, consists with supernatural religion, and Revelation, we do not see. But the problem apparently presents no difficulty to Dr. Smith. We confess that we prefer to this unqualified acceptance of evolution, the more guarded and judicial position of Dr. McCosh, when he says, "The phrase is used to cover all sorts of things, clean and unclean."

Two lectures on wholly different subjects are contained in the volume, which have justly commanded wide attention. That of Chancellor Crosby on Temperance, with numerous reviews of it, of various ability, vehemence, and bitterness, has been published in several forms. In this he publishes an Appendix in reply to some of the misconceptions or censures of his adversaries. We think there is great sympathy among the truest friends of temperance with Dr. Crosby in his criticisms and rebukes of some of the extravagances of many of the promoters of Total Abstinence. But they generally cannot sympathize with his attitude in reference to the practice of Total Abstinence, or efforts to promote it. They believe this the most efficient means of checking the progress, and abating the evils, of intemperance. In regard to the expediency and wisdom of abstinence and its propagation we have no doubt, while we deplore the uncharitable spirit and delusive arguments which so often mar its advocacy.

The other notable lecture is that by Rev. Mr. Dike, entitled "Facts as to Divorce in New England." These facts are absolutely appalling. There has, until recently, been an increasing looseness in New England legislation facilitating divorce. In this, we are sorry to say, Connecticut has earned a bad eminence. The fruits are apparent. Among Protestants, according to Mr. Dike the ratio of divorces to marriages is 1 to 15 in Massachusetts; 1 to 13 in Vermont; 1 to 9 in Rhode Island, and 1 to less than 8 in Connecticut! Mr. Dike shows that a nearly like ratio prevails in the Western Reserve and other portions of the West most largely settled from New England, especially Connecticut—and this along with the general prevalence of the prudential, if no higher, virtues which have distinguished the descendants of the Puritans. But he brings forward many collateral facts showing the correspondent growth of vices and crimes naturally affiliated with great facility and frequency of divorce. What does all this mean? Few studies could be more profitable than searching out the answer to this question, in its interior grounds, its social and economic, its moral and religious bearings. LYMAN H. ATWATER.

THE ENGLISH POETS. Edited by T. H. WARD. Vol. III.—Addison to Blake. Vol. IV.—Wordsworth to Dobell. Macmillan & Co., London and New York. 1880.

These volumes more than justify the favorable criticism of the first in the series. They are in execution certainly equal to the preceding, in some respects may be deemed even superior. There is the same admirable taste in the illustrative selections from the poets. There is the same wise proportionment of the different specimens. If possible, the critical worth of the later volumes is greater.

The popular tendency is to dwell on the *great* names and works, and to neglect a rich field lying outside of these. Burns finds readers by the hundred, where only here and there one finds in Allan Ramsay anything to admire, or in fact knows that any Scottish poet of the name ever existed. George Crabbe had many admirers in his day. But when Leslie Stevens a few years ago ("Hours in a Library," second series) drew attention in a discriminating criticism to the poetical merit of Crabbe's

"Tales in Verse," he was made known for the first time to many people who deemed themselves tolerably versed in English poetry. It is, therefore, one excellent service rendered by the volumes under review, that they recall to mind deserving and neglected poets.

Such an anthology also discloses how large is the amount of fine poetry outside the greater poets. Poets like Parnell, and Dyer, and Shenstone have enriched English poetry not so much by amount, but certainly by the quality of their song. The note in each is distinctive and clear. And as we turn the pages of these volumes, and listen to the many-voiced songs of these English singers, the impression of indebtedness to these lesser poets grows apace. The public has now a full opportunity for recognizing this debt. Scholars, too, can learn how much the development of song in the greater poets may be owing to the inspiration caught from the strains of the lesser. Thomson says he owed his "Winter" to a poem on the same theme by Riccalton. Gray recognized the poetic gift in Dyer, and was "brave" enough to say that "Mr. Dyer has more of poetry in his imagination than any of our number." Thus the larger and richer utterance often comes from the earlier and weaker. It is only literary justice, however, to own the debt to these less known poets. Such volumes as those under consideration secure such justice—sometimes tardy, but in the end complete.

What, however, will by general consent be regarded as the chief excellence of this anthology, is the body of fine criticism which each volume contains. Such critiques as those of Matthew Arnold on Gray and Keats; of Prof. Dowden on Akenside, Goldsmith, Leigh Hunt, and Hartley Coleridge; of Saintsbury on Thomson and Young and Shenstone, are only specimens of the critical ability with which these prefatory notices of the poets abound. It took a long time for the emancipation from the vicious criticisms of the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly* Reviewers to be accomplished. But how thorough has been the freedom achieved will now be made apparent to any one who will study these volumes. The need for this appreciative and discriminating criticism is fundamental. It is a great mistake to suppose that everybody knows good poetry as soon as it is in type. Culture is needed in order to appreciate poetry as well as painting. And these critical notices are a first-rate guide to the true appreciation of our English poets. They could be used to great advantage by every one who is engaged in teaching English literature.

It would be easy to take exceptions here and there to points for criticism or to selected specimens; but when so much is admirably accomplished, we prefer only to commend.

JAMES O. MURRAY.

THE ART OF SPEECH. By L. T. TOWNSEND, D.D. D. Appleton & Co., N. Y.

As the author tells us in the Preface, this treatise is "an outgrowth from instructions given while occupying the chair of Sacred Rhetoric."

Vol. I.—Studies in Poetry and Prose, is soon to be followed by Vol. II.—Studies in Oratory and Logic. The title of the treatise is somewhat indefinite and misleading. As a part of the work is purely philological, and a part grammatical, and still another part literary and rhetorical, it would be difficult, perhaps, to select a title which would fitly express the character of its contents.

The main defect of the volume may be said to lie just here. It lacks logical unity and precision of method. It is, on the one hand, more than elementary, and on the other, less than critical; and while of value in the way of instructive reading on the part of the student, can scarcely be said to answer any higher end. In ten out of the eleven chapters under which the subject is discussed, we note a far too striking confirmation of the author's remark—"that he is indebted to every one who has ever written upon language."

Here lies the second defect—the want of original suggestion. There is too much

old material to make the book stimulating and mark it as a decided contribution to the subject.

Chapter Third,—The Laws of Speech—is the redeeming feature of the treatise, and may most heartily be commended to the student. These laws as stated are throughout philosophic in character and adapted to secure, if properly applied, the best intellectual results.

We await the second volume with some degree of interest, as it may more fully illustrate this suggestive and higher view of rhetorical principles. We need a theory of expression taking its origin in Nature, proceeding by logical method, and calling into exercise every nobler faculty and function.

T. W. HUNT.

VICTOR HUGO: HIS LIFE AND WORKS. From the French of Alfred Barbou, by FRANCES A. SHAW. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1881. Price \$1.00.

Victor Hugo is unquestionably a great genius and a man of noble aspirations. Born and educated a Catholic, his subsequent anti-Christian religious, political, and social radicalism is the consequence of reaction from the godless and inhuman policy prevalent in the administration of the Papal Church. When Christian righteousness and love prevail in the world and give law both to ecclesiastical and secular society, there will be no more Victor Hugos.

The infatuated spirit of adulation which has dictated the present eulogy may be seen from its closing sentence :

"In any event, this nineteenth century, which has witnessed the prodigious conquests of science, the marvelous achievements of industry, which has put steam and electricity in harness and made them its obedient servitors, which has peopled France and the world with legions of illustrious men, which has been the theatre of the grandest and most terrible events—this nineteenth century with all its wise men and with all its triumphs—will have only one name for posterity : it will be called the age of Victor Hugo."

A. A. HODGE.

LITERARY STYLE. By WILLIAM MATHEWS, LL.D. S. C. Griggs & Co., Chicago. Price, \$1.50.

To the half dozen books already given to the American public by Dr. Mathews, another is now added. The author bids fair to rank among the voluminous writers of our literature. The volume before us may properly be assigned to the department of Miscellaneous Essays. Free from the sensational character of our lighter fiction, and equally free from the abstruse method of the didactic essay, it occupies the middle ground of readable and instructive literature. It would be unjust to decide upon the merits of the volume from the critical point of view. In the selection of themes, in method, and general style, the popular intelligence is consulted and the popular heart addressed. There is no attempt at strict logical unity and close sequence of thought. Bearing this in mind, we are free to say that the author has given us a book full of healthful suggestion on timely topics, and fitted to correct many of the current errors of the day. There is a cheerful, manly spirit evident throughout, and the high moral tone of the papers cannot fail to make them valuable to the young men of our land. The main blemish of the book, as, indeed, of all of Dr. Mathews' works, is, excessive quotation and illustration, a frequency of historical and literary reference, which tells too plainly of the *Index Rerum*, and tends to weary both the general and the scholarly reader. There is thus scarcely space enough left for the full development of those leading ideas and principles for whose sake only reference and incident are in point.

We have been especially interested in the opening essay, designed, as it is, to mark the character of the volume. We are glad to note that Dr. Mathews has escaped the common error, even among educated men, of regarding literary style as a something pertaining only to the surface of discourse. He connects good writing with "hard thinking," endorses the theory of Wordsworth, that "style is the incarnation of thought" rather than its "dress," as Pope affirms, and earnestly

pleads for increasing attention in our American colleges to the art of rhetorical and literary expression. We are also glad to state that the author is true, throughout this and all his writings, to the worth and claims of Saxon-English.

T. W. HUNT.

LEADERS OF MEN. A Book of Biographies Specially Written for Youth. By H. A. PAGE. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway. 1881.

This is an admirable book for its purpose, equally entertaining and instructive. The subjects of its biographical sketches are The Prince Consort; Robert Dick, Baker and Geologist; Commodore Goodenough; George Moore; John Duncan, Weaver and Botanist; Samuel Greg; Dr. John Wilson; Dr. Andrew Reed; and Lord Lawrence.

A. A. HODGE.

LIFE AND LETTERS OF JOHN HOWARD RAYMOND. Edited by his eldest Daughter. Small 8vo, pp. x, 744. New York: Fords, Howard & Hulbert. 1881.

A memoir may well be written of a man for whom there can be so justly claimed a foremost place among our American educators. Other men, dead and living, have done more for education by authorship. Intelligent, judicious, thorough, and stimulating as his instruction was, a goodly number of peers might be found for him at different points and in different periods of the great field and work. But in the organization and administration of new and complex institutions it would be difficult to name his superior, or even his equal. The laborious years, nearly twenty, spent at Madison and Rochester Universities, proved, as they in part created, the competence which was so well approved in the work of more than twenty years subsequently spent in the Presidency of the Brooklyn "Polytechnic" and of Vassar College, both of which institutions he organized so admirably that only the slightest changes have since been found necessary. Of broad, rich, carefully cultivated, and symmetrical manhood himself, he had rare power in dealing with men. The homogeneous material with which he had to deal in his earlier spheres of labor was hardly more plastic in his hand than the difficult, heterogeneous material, which challenged and vindicated his wisdom, tact, and power in his later and more responsible posts.

This well-proportioned and admirable memoir from a daughter's hand is composed mainly of letters from him, to him, or of him, which are rich in illustration of his personal and Christian nobleness, and show how much the educator owed to the man. To have won such friendships as are brought to light here, he must have been one of the most attractive as well as one of the worthiest within the sphere in which he moved. Only from within such a home could the story of his rare home-life be truly told.

CHARLES A. AIKEN.

XENOPHON'S SYMPOSIUM. With Notes. By SAMUEL ROSS WINANS, College of New Jersey. Boston: John Allyn, Publisher. 1881. 18mo, pp. 85.

This is a handsome and convenient class-book, one-half text, and one-half illustrative notes and references to grammars. It is a companion volume to the admirable edition of the "Memorabilia" by the same editor.

C. W. HODGE.

MIVART ON THE CAT. The Cat: an Introduction to the Study of Back-boned Animals, especially Mammals. By ST. GEORGE MIVART, Ph.D., F.R.S. New York: Scribner's, 1881 (580 pp., and 200 illustrations).

Mivart is a prominent writer on anatomical subjects, and on the burning questions of Biology. He is a devout Roman Catholic, an apologist for our common faith, and withal a moderate evolutionist, whose strictures on Darwinism have in some measure gained Darwin himself to Mivartism. In his latest book he treats us to a medley of legend, science, and speculative philosophy.

The domestic cat is not derived from the wild-cat of Europe, but from the Egyptian cat, which was tamed, and used in hunting and worshipped, and figured on

monuments probably from the time of Moses, and was introduced to Europe before the Christian era. It was honored in the early Christian Church, petted by Pope Gregory the Great, an inmate of mediæval monasteries, and protected by special laws. Whoever slew a cat was mulcted in as much wheat as would cover it from the ground to the tip of its tail, it being upheld by that appendage.

Cats with blue eyes are usually, but not always, deaf. Sandy-colored cats are mostly males; and the spouses of the same breed are tortoise-shell; so that the same family will contain the two colors according to the sexes. The sexes of some cat-like animals are similarly varied. Cats' eyes can change color under excitement. The nocturnal glow of their eyes is ascribed by Mivart and others to the *reflection* of light; we believe that they *produce* light. Manx cats are distinguished for the absence of the tail: some of them are found on the New Jersey coast; there is also a tailless race in the Crimea; and Japan has a race whose tails are short and curled. A cat which lost its tail by accident afterward had some of its kittens wanting the tail, and this may account for the origin of the Manx variety. In South America there is a silent race of cats which our author would like to have in England. A cat born without fore-limbs was able to jump on its hind-legs like a kangaroo. (Mr. Hill's cat once living in Princeton Museum had no hind-limbs, and it walked on its fore-limbs, with its trunk elevated over its head, like an acrobat promenading on his finger-tips.)

The great question "What is a Cat" takes us through some 500 pages of the book to get a reply. Here we have anatomy, histology, and physiology, with engravings of the various parts, and of the bodies and skulls of different kinds of cats, living and fossil. The author is an expert in Comparative Anatomy, and to the student this part is valuable. We anticipate as one of its consequences an increased mortality among felines, as they will be in greater quest than ever for the dissecting-room.

It is a great omission that no reference is made to the questions started by Ferrier and others as to the physiology of the brain. Calderwood's "Mind and Brain" is still the best book for the general reader on this subject.

The "embryonic development of the cat" introduces the higher discussions of modern Biology. Starting, like all animals, from an egg (though the cats' eggs are very small and hatched long before birth), it follows for a time the course of growth of lower animals, and passing through one stage after another finally appears as the typical carnivore. "The embryo which is to become a cat, successively embodies ideas which are analogous to, though they are never identical with, those which are manifested in rhizopods, sponges, worms, fishes, batrachians, and other inferior animal natures" (p. 521). At one stage the embryo-cat is like a fish as to the structure of its back, brain, heart, and having gill-arches with nerves and arteries running over them (but they are never to have gills). If its development were arrested at this stage, it could only live by sending out gills and taking to water, and so we should call it a fish. Apposite to this we may quote Dr. Parker's observation when studying the development of a fowl's skull. He says that he was like the reader of a palimpsest that had been five or six times written over. In the adult stage was the fowl's skull; earlier than that the form was like the skull of the South American tinnamou; still earlier like the skull of an ostrich; before that it was like the sea-turtle's head; whilst the earliest stage examined by him was fish-like.

These facts are of profound significance, and some students of science think that they by themselves prove the whole scheme of evolution. They certainly show a deep, not merely a superficial, unity of actual structure; but it is a different question how this affinity has arisen. And as Parker himself well remarks, the case is not so simple as it appears; but at every turn Embryology itself brings up perplexing variations.

The cat's psychology is one of the newer branches of mental science. In recent

years observations have been made on the mental habits and signs of intelligence of the lower animals, and attempts made to marshal them into a foreshadowing of human intelligence. We can see no objection to this way of arguing. The old views of blind instinct doing everything are exploded. Hereditary instinct exists in all animals, even in ourselves. It is manifested in blind kittens spitting at the dog which they cannot see, and even at the smell of the human hand that was fondling a dog; and in the specially savage spirit of the young of the wild-cat. But even if the Bible had not so informed us, we might expect to find in every animal as much intelligence, even power of reasoning, as will be necessary for its place in nature. Darwin's attempt to make out a moral character for the prairie-dog has not been a great success. But Dr. McCook has been following Solomon in observing the ants, where he finds not only intelligence, but good temper, and an obliging disposition and public spirit, which may well put us selfish animals to shame.

Our author gives the cat credit for a larger measure of intelligence than is usually supposed. In acuteness of sense-perception it far surpasses us, as every intelligent mouse knows. It likewise excels in possessing a steady head, and in the accurate use of its limbs, as seen when it passes through the china-closet without upsetting anything, and in always alighting on its feet. Though not partial to bathing, it can swim, and will take to water to catch fish or to rescue its young. (The kittens are not easily drowned, because at time of birth there is an open passage in the heart, so as to make it unnecessary for the blood to go round by the lungs).

The cat has feelings, emotions, good memory, imagination, and a measure of judgment or reasoning. It will learn to use a latch to open a door, to strike a knocker, or ring a bell, will touch your hand and mew at you to open the door for it or to give it some food, it will not help itself till your back is turned, and it will hide behind a log or even on a cow's back awaiting the approach of an unsuspecting bird. Different individuals vary in disposition and mental ability. In the London Zoological Gardens one specimen of the clouded tiger (an allied feline) was remarkably tame and gentle, whilst another was exceptionally ill-tempered and savage. Our author does not explain how a cat purs; but he accounts for its sporting with a mouse on the theory of its exercising its powers. Thus each capture becomes a lesson in catching.

Mivart makes man's distinguishing characteristic to be found in *speech*, not in the articulate words, but in the mental process of tying the words to thoughts. The cat may learn to understand some words, as its own name; but it is not known to have any power of delineation or self-consciousness. Strange that in his list of human mental powers (p. 372) no place is given to the moral faculty, the most exalted and characteristic of man's attributes.

It has been found that a highly organized animal is composed of many microscopic cells, each of which has a measure of individuality and independent life of its own, and is comparable to the whole of one of the lower or one-celled animals. The one cell which constitutes the Proteus animalcule is equal to all the necessities of existence and reproduction; but the cat consists of many millions of cells, some forming bone, others flesh, or brain, or blood, or skin. Complexity of structure and physiological division of labor are characteristic of dignity in animal or vegetable life. What then is the moving power that directs all this complex organism, so as to make the cat one animal, and not a mere colony of separate animals? This controlling power is usually termed the general life, as distinguished from local life; and then when asked what is its nature, biologists reply that it is merely the sum total of the potencies of the several cells. Mivart, whilst admitting this kind of life, ascribes also to the cat a *soul* or *psyché* (in the Aristotelian sense), and by the same line of argument he finds a soul also in plants. The terminology is somewhat inconvenient; but that there is a co-ordinating and governing something in complex animals and plants we believe. The cat's "soul" he deems not a substance, ca-

pable of surviving the body; but the "function" of the body, arising with its beginning, controlling its growth and activity, and perishing along with it. The human soul has higher qualities and survives the body.

The cat's relation to its environment (its "hexicology") prepares the way for the discussion of its origin. The colors of felines are in some measure correlated with their surroundings, often for concealment. Sandy plains have tawny lions or pumas; though the lion's cubs are barred and the puma's cubs are spotted. The tiger's stripes conceal him amid the long jungle-grass; and the leopard's spots are indistinguishable amid the spotted shadows cast by forest leaves. But in many cases these explanations fail.

The search after the cat's pedigree leads to the higher regions of speculation. Mivart from the first opposed Darwin's view of "Natural Selection," or external influences being the main factor in originating new species;* and enunciated the view that new species are evolved "through the orderly operation of powers divinely implanted" in creation, some of these being in the animal itself, but limited and stimulated by the environment. He adds: "This view can be hardly denied by any consistent persons who are not prepared to maintain that with the birth of every very exceptionally formed kitten a direct intervention of the First Cause takes place." He then proceeds (using the assistance and material furnished by Professor Cope, of this country) to trace the pedigree of cats (living and fossil) and of carnivores generally, going back as far as the fishes, but refusing to pass by Ascidiæans to the Invertebrates.

On its first enunciation the theory of development was hastily welcomed in some quarters, because of its supposed simplicity and because it seemed to explain species without recourse to the supernatural; and for this last reason it was opposed by others as atheistic. It has come, however, to be found not so simple as it first appeared, and it turns out that it raises more difficulties in the way of atheism than it removes. A great deal of solid evidence has been found in its favor, from the variations of species giving rise to new races, from embryology, comparative anatomy, palæontology, and geographical distribution of animals. The argument from these independent sources is cumulative; and the theory has had the significant honor of opening the way to new discoveries. Yet there are cases of similarity of structure which it fails to explain. It may be a law of nature within limited groups, and may run parallel with the truth even more extensively, but it is found to be complex in its operations, and there are unseen influences constantly interfering with or controlling its action.†

Combining the tendency of animals to vary only in definite directions with his view as to the "soul," which he deems the cause of this tendency, Mr. Mivart comes to the conclusion that the real question of the genesis of species is a question

* Canon Mosely has shown that natural selection taken alone is purely destructive, and that it can originate nothing. Every naturalist admits that it indirectly affects species by determining the survival of the fittest.

† On the origin of man, geology, archæology, and considerations bearing on structure, habits, and intelligence, go against his development, suggesting something special in his case. On the other hand, we are not to strain the Mosaic record, which, however definite as to God being the author of all things, and as to His having made man after His own image, is a mere table of contents as to the mode of creation. As a whole, it has been confirmed by modern discovery, but its brief declarations are general, and have been interpreted in several senses. The difficulty found in unfolding its hints as to the unknown past, is like that experienced in developing the Apocalyptic foreshadowings of the unknown future. Whatever be the merits or demerits of evolution, we are satisfied that the process by which God formed beast and man, "dust from the earth," was as orderly and elegant as the results were "very good."

of psychogenesis, or of the origin of the "soul" of animals. He adds that "Mr. Darwin now practically admits this view, as he admits that 'abrupt, strongly marked changes' may occur 'neither beneficial nor injurious,' produced by unknown agencies lying deep in the nature of the organism." From the problem of psychogenesis Mivart goes to the agency of God as its only solution. The activity of God in so causing new species to appear belongs to that secondary or derivative creation "per temporum moras," which has been distinguished from instantaneous creation "out of nothing" by divines from Augustine to Charles Hodge.

Some people have an uneasy feeling when they find science invading all departments of philosophy, and even of faith. And it is well to be on our guard; for the enemy will endeavor to press every new line of investigation into his service. But Biology is passing through the changes which Astronomy, Geology, Egyptology, and Scripture-recension have experienced; once deemed hostile, it is coming round to reinforce Christianity. By establishing the unity of nature, or monism, it is now refuting polytheism in India and Japan, and is preparing people for faith in one God. All the Physical Sciences have combined to condemn every system of religion except the Bible-system. It is true that students of science resent attempts to confine their investigations within the limits of a religious formula, especially by men who do not understand the nature of scientific evidence. Yet the experience of the past and the signs of the present (when even sceptics feel that their science needs supplementing by quasi-theistic hypotheses), teach us that Christianity has just as much to hope for, and as little to fear, from the science of the cat and its allies, as from the progress of any other kind of research.

GEORGE MACLOSKIE.

THE FOLLOWING WORKS HAVE BEEN RECEIVED :

ROBERT CARTER & BROS., NEW YORK :

THE PALACE BEAUTIFUL; or, Sermons to Children. By W. B. NEWTON. 12mo, pp. 348.

BOYS AND GIRLS PLAYING, and other Addresses to Children. By Rev. JOHN C. RYLE, D.D. 12mo, pp. 193. 1881.

OUTSIDE THE WALLS. By Mrs. A. M. M. PAYNE. Small 8vo, pp. 351. 1881.

FROM A. D. F. RANDOLPH & CO., NEW YORK :

THE MISSION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH. A sermon delivered on the opening of the Council of the Presbyterian Alliance, by WM. M. PAXTON, D.D. 24mo, pp. 36. 10 cents.

JOHN WYCLIFFE AND THE FIRST ENGLISH BIBLE. An Oration by R. S. STORRS, D.D., LL.D. 8vo, pp. 84. 30 cents.

COMFORT FOR THE MOTHERS OF ANGELS. Compiled by the author of "Heartsease." 16mo, pp. 36. 50 cents.

FROM TROW'S PRINTING & PUBLISHING CO. :

SUGGESTIONS TO YOUNG LAWYERS. An address at the Commencement of Columbia College Law-School. By CORTLANDT PARKER. 8vo, pp. 16.

FROM EZRA A. COOK, CHICAGO :

REVISED ODD FELLOWSHIP, illustrated; The complete revised Ritual of the Lodge; Encampment of the Rebekah Degree, profusely illustrated. By Pres. J. BLANCHARD, of Wheaton College.

INDEX.

N. marks the contribution as one found among NOTES AND NOTICES; *R.* as found among REVIEWS.

- ABBOT's Authorship of the Fourth Gospel. R. 186
Aiken (C. A.)...N. 174; R. 199, 211, 218, 426, 444, 609, 616, 617, 808, 816.
Allen's Fragments of Christian History. R. 604
Assassination (The) of the President. N. 775
Atwater (L. H.), Horace Bushnell... 114
—...N. 775; R. 220, 631, 812
BAER's Liber Proverbiorum...R. 596
Baird (H. M.)...R. 198, 415
Barbon's Victor Hugo (F. A. Shaw). R. 815
Barry's Manifold Witness for Christ. R. 616
Baumstark's Zum Kirchlichen Frieden. R. 211
Beck's Homiletische Lektionen...R. 806
Beecher (W. J.)...R. 402, 601, 630, 805
Bell's Henry Martyn...R. 610
Bevan's Sermons to Students...R. 438
Bible Revision (Plan of the New). Article by T. W. Chambers...449
Bible (The) Wine Question. Article by Dunlop Moore... 80
Biblical (The) Blank. Article by R. M. Patterson...738
Bissell's Apocrypha of the Old Testament. R. 408
Blaikie's Personal Life of David Livingstone...R. 610
Book (The) of Discipline in a revised form, as proposed by the Assembly's Revision Committee. Article by A. T. McGill and E. P. Humphrey... 284
Boston Monday Lectures, 1880-1881. R. 812
Bowen's Gleanings from a Literary Life. R. 222
Briggs (C. A.), The Provincial Assembly of London, 1647-1660... 54
— Critical Theories of the Sacred Scriptures in relation to their Inspiration...550
— N. 169, 393, 779; R. 181, 210, 407, 408, 421, 628, 631, 785, 793, 811.
Brosch's Geschichte des Kirchenstaats. R. 198
Brown (Francis)...N. 592; R. 183, 444, 594, 600.
Bruce's Humiliation of Christ...R. 618
Bushnell, Horace. Article by L. H. Atwater... 114
CAIRNS's Unbelief in the Eighteenth Century...R. 795
Calderwood's Relations of Science and Religion...R. 613
Candlish's Christian Sacraments...R. 206
Chambers' (T. W.), The Plan of the New Bible Revision... 449
— N. 177, 773; R. 189, 198, 205, 403, 607, 614, 625, 801, 806.
Chambers's (W.) St. Giles Lectures...R. 793
Charteris's Canonicy...R. 594
Cheever's Faith, Doubt, and Evidence. R. 801
China, Protestant Missions in. Article by S. Wells Williams... 33
Christliche Glaube und Menschliche Freiheit...R. 614
Clark's Wesley Memorial Volume...R. 609
Comba's Waldo and the Waldensians before the Reformation...R. 605
Consecrated Women (Claudia)...R. 809
Convention, Inter-Seminary Missionary. N. 176
Cook's Boston Monday Lectures, 1879. R. 220
Cooke's Religion and Chemistry...R. 427
Cowles's Luke: Gospel History and Acts of the Apostles...R. 599
— Matthew and Mark...R. 599
Critical Theories of the Sacred Scriptures in relation to their Inspiration. Article by C. A. Briggs... 550
Crosby (Howard)...R. 192, 194, 214, 600
— True Humanity of Christ...R. 429
Cup of Consolation...R. 436
Cutler (Carrol)...R. 446
DALE's Versöhnungstod Christi...R. 205
Darling (Henry), Preaching and Modern Scepticism... 757
De Lagarde's Orientalia, II... R. 784
Delitzsch's Messianic Prophecies...R. 407
Delmas' Huguenots of La Rochelle...R. 193
Demarest (David D.), John à Lasco... 1
Demarest's (J. T.) Catholic Epistles...R. 192
Denifle's Tauler's Bekehrung...R. 606
De Witt (John)...R. 417
Diary and Letters of Frances Burney (Madame D'Arblay)...R. 218

- Dillmann's Exodus and Leviticus...R. 594
 Diman's Theistic Argument as affected by recent Theories.....R. 799
 Dix's Lectures on the first Prayer-book of King Edward VI.....R. 807
 Dorner's System of Christian Doctrine, I. R. 421
 — Christliche Glaubenslehre, II, 1. R. 421
 Douglass's Book of Judges.....R. 785
 Dykes's Daily Prayers for the Household. R. 628
- EDWARDS's Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, etc.....R. 204
 Eells (J.).....R. 438
 Eternal Purpose: A Study of the Scripture Doctrine of Immortality.....R. 624
 Ethical (The) Element in our Earlier Literature. Article by T. W. Hunt.... 530
 Evans (L. J.).....R. 193, 408
 Exegetical Note on Luke xv. 10....N. 177
- FABER's Thoughts on Great Mysteries. R. 211
 Farrar's Ephphatha.....R. 214
 Fischer's Bunsen's Allgemeines Evangelisches Gesang-und Gebetbuch....R. 629
 Floigl's Chronologie der Bibel, des Manetho und Berossus.....R. 601
 Force of *ἐνόπιον* in Luke xv. 10....N. 177
 Freeman's Historical Geography of Europe. R. 810
- GAIL HAMILTON's Divine Guidance. R. 808
 General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., 1881....N. 580
 General Synod (The) of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America...N. 773
 George's Progress and Poverty....R. 631
 Given's Truth of Scripture in Connection with Revelation, etc.....R. 615
 Godet's Romans, I., II.....R. 191, 787
 Goebel's Parabeln Jesu.....R. 189
 Goulburn's Everlasting Punishment. R. 208
 Gray's Biblical Museum, VI., VII..R. 785
 Green (W. H.). R. 179, 222, 597, 780
 Grounds (The) and Methods of the Temperance Reform. Article by J. W. Mears. 500
 Guillemard's Hebraisms in the N. T. R. 183
 Guinness's Approaching End of the Age. R. 428
- HACKENSCHMIDT's Die Kirche im Glauben des Evangelischen Christen....R. 806
 Haffner's Das Gebet des Herrn....R. 806
 Hagenbach's History of Christian Doctrine, I., II.....R. 195, 411
 Hase's Miracle Plays and Sacred Dramas. R. 447
 Hatfield (E. F.).....R. 218, 439, 809
 Havergal. Memorials of Frances R..R. 218
 Hebrew (The) Review....N. 397
 Heilprin's Historical Poetry of the Ancient Hebrews.....R. 181
 Heppes's Geschichte des Pietismus und der Mystik.....R. 413
- Hessey's Sunday: Its Origin, History, etc.....R. 215
 Hitchcock (R. D.).....R. 400
 Hodge (A. A.)...N. 176, 580; R. 195, 204, 212, 214, 222, 411, 427, 428, 434, 435, 611, 613, 624, 629, 788, 795, 802, 803, 815, 816.
 — Life of Charles Hodge.....R. 199
 Hodge (A. A., and B. B. Warfield). Inspiration.....R. 225
 Hodge, Charles. Article by F. L. Patton. 349
 — (C. W.)....R. 186, 222, 404, 594, 599, 615, 816.
 Hofmann's (J. C. K. von), Biblische Hermeneutik.....R. 179
 Homiletical (The) Quarterly.....N. 398
 Hopkins (S. M.).....R. 194, 791, 807
 Howson's Evidential Value of the Acts of the Apostles.....R. 599
 Humphrey (E. P. and A. T. McGill), The Book of Discipline in a revised form as proposed by the Assembly's Revision Committee.....284
 Humphrey (Z. M.), Henry Boynton Smith. 474
 Hunt (T. W.), The Ethical Element in our Earlier Literature.....530
 —.....R. 221, 223, 447, 814, 815
 Huntington (E. A.).....R. 597
- IMBRIE's Handbook of English-Japanese Etymology. R. 222
 Inspiration. Article by A. A. Hodge and B. B. Warfield.....225
 Inter-Seminary Convention.....N. 176
 Irenæus, References to Aquila's Version. N. 399, 593
 Irvin (W.).....R. 199
- JACKSON's (G. A.) Fathers of the Third Century.....R. 790
 Jackson (S. M.)...N. 399, 593; R. 412, 606
 Japps' Master Missionaries.....R. 611
 Johnson (Herrick).....R. 436, 437
 — Christianity's Challenge.....R. 628
- KALKAR's Geschichte der Christlichen Mission, II.....R. 199
 Kip's Unnoticed Things of Scripture. R. 408
 Krauszold's Katechetik für Schule und Kirche.....R. 804
 Krieg's Monotheismus der Offenbarung, u. s. w. R. 426
- LANDERER's Neueste Dogmengeschichte. R. 791
 Lasco, John à. Article by D. D. Demarest.....I
 Lemme's Religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung des Dekalogs.....R. 408
 Lenormant's Les Origines de l'Histoire. R. 444
 Lowrie, S. T.....R. 191, 787
 Luthardt's Die Modernen Weltanschauungen.....R. 617

- MACDUFF's In Christo.....R. 439
 Macfarlane's Life and Times of George Lawson.....R. 798
 Macleod's Gentle Heart.....R. 436
 Macloskie, G. R. 816
 Macpherson's Westminster Confession of Faith.....R. 802
 Mathews's Literary Style.....R. 815
 McGill (A. T.).....R. 215, 808
 McGill (A. T., and E. P. Humphrey), The Book of Discipline in a revised form as proposed by the Assembly's Revision Committee.....284
 McNiece (R. G.), Mormonism.....331
 Mears (J. W.), The Grounds and Methods of the Temperance Reform.....500
 Mediæval Jewish Theology. Article by H. P. Smith.....720
 Merivale's Continental Teutons....R. 197
 Meyer's Ephesians and Philemon...R. 600
 — (Lünemian's), Thessalonians...R. 600
 Mitchell's Critical Handbook.....R. 594
 — Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar...R. 630
 Mivart on the Cat.....R. 816
 Moffat (J. C.)...R. 411, 439, 604, 790, 798
 Moore (Dunlop), The Bible Wine Question.....80
 — R. 428
 Mormonism. Article by R. G. McNiece.....331
 Morris's (C.) Manual of Classical Literature.....R. 217
 Morris (E. D.).....R. 424
 — Outlines of Lectures on the Christian Doctrine.....R. 617
 Morris's (G. S.) British Thought and Thinkers.....R. 446
 Müller's Sacred Books of the East, VI., IX. R. 631
 Murray, J. O.....R. 813
- NICOLL's Incarnate Saviour.....R. 603
 Norris's New Testament according to the Authorized Version R. 597
- OLIPIANT's Land of Gilead.....R. 788
 Orris (S. S.).....R. 217
 Overbeck's Zur Geschichte des Kanons R. 402
- PAGE's Leaders of Men.....R. 816
 Palmer's (H. S.) Sinai.....R. 194
 Palmer's (Ray) Voices of Hope and Gladness.....R. 439
 Patterson (Robert M.), The Biblical Blank. 738
 — R. 403
 Patton (F. L.), Charles Hodge.....349
 — R. 795, 799
 Paul's Thorn in the Flesh.....N. 378
 Philippi's Christliche Glaubenslehre, VI. R. 203
 Plan (The) of the New Bible Revision. Article by T. W. Chambers 449
 Poole's History of the Huguenots of the Dispersion...R. 415
 Porter's Agnosticism.....R. 428
- Post-exilian portion of our Lord's Genealogy.....N. 388
 Potter's Sermons of the City.....R. 438
 Preaching and Modern Scepticism. Article by Henry Darling.....757
 Prentiss (G. L.). R. 197, 211, 413, 610, 804
 Presbyterian Council in Philadelphia. N. 169
 — Report of Proceedings R. 435
 Presbyterian Theological Education in Great Britain and Ireland N. 174
 Prevalent (The) Confusion; and the attitude of Christian Faith. Article by R. B. Welch.....261
 Proof of New Testament Miracle compared with the Proof of the Miracle of the Roman Calendar. Article by C. R. Vaughan. 687
 Protestant Missions in China during the last half century. Article by S. Wells Williams.....33
 Provincial (The) Assembly of London, 1647-1660. Article by C. A. Briggs. 54
 Pusey's What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment? R. 208
- RAWLINSON's Origin of Nations...R. 788
 — History of Ancient Egypt...R. 811
 Raymond (J. H.) Life and Letters of. R. 816
 Reference of Irenæus to Aquila's Version. N. 399, 593
 Reid's Christ and His Religion...R. 437
 Renan's English Conferences....R. 411
 Reorganization of the Synods. Article by E. N. White.....145
 Revised New Testament (Notes on the). Article by M. R. Vincent 633
 Revue des Études Juives. N. 592
 Ritschl's Geschichte des Pietismus, I. R. 413
 Robinson's Selection of Spiritual Songs. R. 629
- Root (The) קֹדֶשׁ in the Old Testament. N. 588
 Rothe's Theologische Encyclopädie. R. 202
 — Geschichte der Predigt.....R. 805
 Rysse's Gregorius Thaumaturgus. R. 605
- SABBATH Essays.....R. 433
 Sayce's Smith's Chaldean Account of Genesis.....R. 600
 Schaff (Philip).....N. 378; R. 202, 605, 629, 810.
 — Dictionary of the Bible R. 193
 — Popular Commentary on the N. T., II.....R. 404
 — Person of Christ.....R. 428
 Scheele's Theologische Symbolik..R. 607
 Schmid's Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte, I.....R. 194
 Scotch Sermons.....R. 212
 Shedd (W. G. T.)...R. 208, 429, 617, 618
 Skeat's Etymological Dictionary of the English Language.....R. 223
 Smith (Henry Boynton). Article by Z. M. Humphrey.....474
 — His Life and Works.....R. 417

- Smith (Henry P.), Mediæval Jewish Theology..... 720
 — N. 397, 588; R. 402, 596, 784, 785
 Smith's (W. R.), Old Testament in the Jewish Church..... R. 780
 Spurgeon's John Ploughman's Pictures..... R. 214
 Stanford's Philip Doddridge..... R. 610
 Stanley's Christian Institutions... R. 625
 Steinmeyer's Epiphanien im Leben des Herrn..... R. 621
 Stoughton's William Wilberforce.. R. 610
 — History of Religion in England..... R. 795
 Stratmann's Dictionary of the Old English Language..... R. 221
 Studer's Pessimismus im Kampf mit der Orthodoxie... R. 597
 Symington's Messiah the Prince... R. 803
 Symonds's Sketches and Studies in Southern Europe..... R. 444
 Synods (Reorganization of the). Article by E. N. White..... 145

 TAIT'S (Archbishop of Canterbury) Church of the Future..... R. 434
 Taylor (W. M.)..... R. 603, 611
 Temperance Reform (The Grounds and Methods of the). Article by J. W. Mears..... 500
 Thomson's The Land and the Book. R. 400
 Townsend's Art of Speech..... R. 814

 VAN DYKE'S Through the Prison to the Throne..... R. 808
 Vaughan (Clement R.), The Proof of New Testament Miracle compared with the Proof of the Miracle of the Roman Calendar..... 687
 Vernacular Bibles and the Reformation. N. 384
 Vincent (Marvin R.), Notes on the Revised New Testament..... 633
 Vinton (Frederic)..... N. 384

 WACE'S Foundations of Faith..... R. 424
 Ward's English Poets, III., IV..... R. 813
 Warfield (B. B.)..N. 388; R. 196, 599, 610
 Warfield (B. B., and A. A. Hodge), Inspiration .. 225
 Welch (R. B.), The Prevalent Confusion; and the Attitude of Christian Faith. 261
 —..... R. 203, 206, 440, 621
 Wendt's Symbolik der Römisch-Katholischen Kirche..... R. 414
 White (E. N.), Reorganization of the Synods..... 145
 Wiclif's De Christo et suo adversario Antichristo..... R. 210
 Wiener's Das Evangelische Pfarrhaus..... R. 806
 Williams (S. Wells), Protestant Missions in China during the last half century. 33
 Wilson (S. J.)..... R. 605, 628, 788
 Wilson's (W.) Memorials of R. S. Candlish..... R. 611
 Winans's Xenophon's Memorabilia. R. 222
 — Xenophon's Symposium..... R. 816
 Winchell's Preadamites..... R. 440
 Wordsworth's Discourse on Scottish Church History..... R. 793
 Wünsche's Bibliotheca Rabbinica, III..... R. 402
 — Jerusalemische Talmud..... R. 402
 Wüstenfeld's Synaxarium, I., II.... R. 412

 ZAHN'S Acta Joannis..... R. 196
 Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft..... N. 779

[illegible]

FACULTY

100





